

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06827451 7



ZHEF









THE BAPTISMAL QUESTION.

A

4789

DISCUSSION

OF THE

BAPTISMAL QUESTION.

CONSISTING OF

- I. HINTS TO AN INQUIRER ON THE SUBJECT OF BAPTISM. BY REV. MESSRS. COOKE AND TOWNE.
- II. REVIEW OF THE "HINTS." BY REV. WILLIAM HAGUE.
- III. REJOINDER TO THE REVIEW. BY REV. MESSRS. COOKE AND TOWNE.
- IV. EXAMINATION OF THE REJOINDER. BY REV. WILLIAM HAGUE.

BOSTON:

GOULD, KENDALL AND LINCOLN,  
59 WASHINGTON STREET.

1842.

24789-  
EH

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY  
ASTOR  
TILDEN  
18

## PUBLISHERS' NOTICE.

---

TOWARDS the close of last May, Rev. Messrs. Cooke and Towne published a pamphlet, entitled, "Hints to an Inquirer, on the subject of Baptism," in which the views and practices of the Baptists were so treated, that some reply, on the part of the denomination, seemed to be called for. On application to Mr. Hague, he immediately prepared a Review of that work, and this called forth a Rejoinder, from Messrs. Cooke and Towne, which was published in one small volume;—first, their "Hints," in a fair, legible type; next, Mr. Hague's Review, in type so fine and dim, that very few persons could read it without endangering their eyes; and then their Rejoinder to the Review, in type large and clear. Thus, while in their advertisement there was an appearance of candor, in publishing both sides, there was, in reality, a want of candor and fairness, in so publishing the Review, that very few could do it justice in the perusal.

In the "Note" to Cooke and Towne's Rejoinder, it is said, "We learn that complaint has been made of our printing the whole of Mr. Hague's pamphlet with ours. His publishers, in putting it forth without securing the copyright, as they might have done for a trifle, virtually gave it to the public, and have no legal or moral right, and no right on the score of courtesy, to complain of any one for publishing it."

Allowing, that while omitting to take out a copyright (as is *usual*, in publishing a small pamphlet), we forfeited our claim of "legal right," we are unable to see that it can affect our "moral right," or annul all claim of "courtesy!" They were distinctly informed, that we objected to their publishing our work in the way they did. There is a "law of trade," in reference to republishing foreign works, not entitled to a copyright in this country, that he who first obtains a complete copy, secures to himself the right of publishing; and in so high regard is this law of honor and courtesy held, that in some few instances, where it has been violated, the course has been condemned, on the part of the 'trade,' by a refusal to purchase or sell copies of the edition thus published. How, then, must our surprise have been excited, to find this law of honor, and regard to moral right, so strictly adhered to by men of the world, unheeded by those who profess to be governed by the pure principles of the gospel!

It has been our wish, in issuing the "Examination of the Rejoinder," by Mr. Hague, to publish *both* sides fully—to put forth the whole discussion in one volume. But the copyright of the "Hints" and "Rejoinder" having been secured to the publishers, we have not been permitted to put these works in our own type, so

as to have the numbers of the pages to succeed each other in regular order, as would have been desirable. We have, however, purchased the right of printing from the stereotype plates of Messrs. Cooke and Towne's productions, and bound them up with our own publications; although, to accomplish our object, we have been forced to adopt type unlike our own, and to leave the paging without arrangement, which would give the whole an appearance of unity.

Nevertheless, the public will see that we have done all that we could, under the circumstances of the case, to present to view the whole discussion in a form which shall be easy of perusal, and convenient for the sake of reference. As we have not cared to secure for ourselves pecuniary profit, we may ask with the more confidence, that the whole may be read with a candid mind, "an applying conscience, and a retentive memory."

For the benefit of such as are already in possession of the previous works, and may feel indisposed to purchase the same again, Mr. Hague's Examination of Messrs. Cooke and Towne's Rejoinder has been republished in a separate form, and may be had at a reduced price.

THE PUBLISHERS.

*Boston, December, 1842.*

H I N T S

TO

A N I N Q U I R E R

ON THE SUBJECT OF BAPTISM.

FIRST PUBLISHED IN THE NEW ENGLAND PURITAN.

BY

PARSONS COOKE AND JOSEPH H. TOWNE.

---

B O S T O N :

PUBLISHED BY WASHINGTON CLAPP,  
AT THE OFFICE OF THE NEW ENGLAND PURITAN.

1842.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1842,  
By WASHINGTON CLAPP,  
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

---

STEREOTYPED BY  
GEORGE A. CURTIS,  
N. ENGLAND TYPE AND STEREOTYPE FOUNDRY, BOSTON.



# HINTS TO AN INQUIRER.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

THOSE who practise immersion assume the position, that they may lawfully debar from the Lord's table all who administer baptism in other ways. This gives the question before us an importance which otherwise would not belong to it. If the exclusive principle advocated by this body of Christians is defensible on scriptural grounds, the greater part of Christ's professed disciples are intruders at his table. But if, on the other hand, Immersers are wrong, they are guilty of exercising an usurped authority in the house of God, and of withholding the children's bread.

The honest inquirer on this subject, therefore, in settling the question, whether he shall be immersed and unite with Immersers, must, at the same time, settle the question as to close communion. He cannot join them in church fellowship, without giving his sanction to their exclusive principle. This fact he should take along with him, through the whole argument, and put every suggestion in favor of immersion to the test of the inquiry—*Is this sure and satisfactory ground on which to base close communion?*

As to the use of names, we must be excused from using the term "Baptists," for those who practise immersion. The application to them of this name, is equivalent to a concession, that we do not baptize. And there is a kind of charm attached

to the name, carrying with it an impression, injurious to the force of opposite arguments. The influence of a name on this subject, has an illustration of this kind. A Campbellite, holding forth to an uncultivated audience at the west, in favor of immersion, broke forth in the following eloquent appeal:—“Was it John the Methodist? No. Was it John the Episcopalian? No. Was it John the Presbyterian? No. *It was John the Baptist.*” And this was doubtless the end of all strife, for those who could be convinced by the sound of a name. But the sound of a name has its influence more or less with all; and it is not fit that in this respect, an advantage should be conceded to either side. For any sect to claim the exclusive use of the term Baptists, is no more equitable than that they should claim an exclusive use of the name believers; in a way to imply that no others believe in Christ but themselves. But if they choose thus to beg the question, it is not wise in us to concede it. We take the liberty, therefore, so far as we have occasion to apply a name in these remarks, to use the term Immersers instead of Baptists—a term which need not be offensive to them, as it has no invidious intent with us. We are aware that immersion, unscriptural as we conceive it to be, is associated with the purest feelings of many devout disciples of our blessed Lord; and far be it from us to trifle with such feelings. But the cause of truth requires it of all Pedobaptists, that they take special pains to break the force of a habit; and discard, entirely, the use of a term so injurious to themselves. And, furthermore, it is the duty of Immersers, themselves, to discard its exclusive use, and that for the sake of consistency. In their new translation of the Bible, they have substituted immerse, for baptize, under the idea that baptize is not a fit and proper word to express the thing, and thus have virtually expunged baptism from the Bible. And now it is passing strange, if they, who are taking measures to deprive the Christian world of the very name of baptism, should assume the monopoly of that name, and style

themselves the only Baptists. Surely, after having blotted the word from the Bible, they will not deem it fit to retain it as the name of their sect. Though the sect in its infancy, was baptized by this name, yet now, having attained to maturer knowledge, and discovered that baptize does not express the true idea, they may be expected to secure a change of name, and conform to their riper knowledge.

We wish the inquirer to mark in the outset that the nice and punctilious regard to the forms of outward rites, so much insisted upon in the Mosaic ritual, is not required of us. A divine simplicity characterizes the New Testament institutions. It is contrary to the genius of the gospel to lay great stress on outward rites. It rather invites the main solitudes upon ordering the heart and life. The kingdom of God consisteth not in meats and drinks, but in righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. Neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.

And much less does the gospel lay a stress *on the mode of performing* an external rite, and require the conscience to be burdened with the inquiry, whether it shall be done in this way or that. It has instituted two rites, as simple as it was possible to make them, and says nothing about a danger to be incurred, by failing to perform the simple ceremonies, precisely after a particular way.

Let the inquirer take notice, that *Immersionists assume more responsibility than we do, and have more to prove.* Their principles of close communion lay them under obligations *to show to an absolute certainty*, that inspiration fixes that their way, and no other way, of applying water is baptism. On the other hand, we need only show that there is no such certainty and we gain the question in dispute. For what intelligent and candid mind could ever feel justified in basing *close communion upon an external ceremony of doubtful obligation?* We expect, however, to show more than this. While we hold that the New Testament insists upon no particular way

of applying the water as essential, we contend that it favors sprinkling or pouring; and that of all the conceivable forms of baptism, immersion is the most unnatural and improbable, and the farthest from the true design of the rite.

## CHAPTER I.

### MEANING OF THE WORD BAPTIZE.

THE argument for immersion is founded upon the assumption, that the words baptism and immersion convey the same idea. But this is a gross mistake. Baptism expresses the whole idea of the rite, including the invoking of the Trinity, the receiving of the candidate's implied profession of faith, the application of the water, and the like. Immersion expresses only a fraction of this idea. The Baptizer's Letter furnishes us with an apt illustration. "If I fall from a ship's side and am thoroughly immersed—is that baptism? No. Or if men immerse me by force—is that baptism? No. Or if I am immersed with my own consent, but not in the name of the Trinity—is that baptism? No. Well, then, neither immersion, nor the use of water in any way is baptism; WHICH IS SOMETHING MORE." This is sufficient to show that baptism and immersion are not synonymous terms.

But it is said that the Greek words *bapto* and *baptizo* (both of the same origin, and so nearly identical in meaning as to allow of our speaking of them as one word) decide the controversy. We should expect confident assertions in regard to these words; for if they fail, a very material part of the Immerser's argument vanishes. Now we affirm that these words determine nothing in this controversy, unless they have a fixed and invariable meaning, *allowing water to be applied only in one way*. If, on investigation, it be found that these words so much relied on, have different senses; if in one connection they mean to plunge, and in another to wash, and in another

to tinge or color, and in another to sprinkle, the mere general command to baptize does not tell us how the water shall be used.

The question, then, before us is—have these words a fixed and invariable meaning? Even if we were to allow (as we do not) that to immerse is the *primary* signification of these terms, it would not fix us to that way of applying water. *Words very often lose their primary meaning.* Instance the English word villain, primarily a servant; the word clerk, primarily a clergyman. Examples without number might be adduced, wherein the primary meaning is wholly superseded. And then many words which retain their primary meaning have also *secondary meanings*. The English noun, general, means the whole or totality, and then secondarily, a military officer. The word meal is primarily used of the flour of corn, and then of a repast. The word dowry, primarily means a price paid for a wife; and secondarily almost the opposite, that is, a portion received with a wife; and so of many others.

Again: *when words go abroad and come into a foreign language*, they often change their meaning. Hence, if it could be shown that the Greeks used the word for immersion, and nothing else, it would not follow that the Jews, having adopted it as a foreign word, retained the same sense; nor that it bears such a meaning in the New Testament, as Greek writers give it. These suggestions are sufficient to raise at least the suspicion, that it is hazardous to rest close communion upon the assumption, that the word baptize necessarily carries the force of immersion.

The inquirer is now prepared to come nearer to the point, and see how these words are actually used. We will begin with *uninspired writers*. Callimachus and his commentators use bapto, to denote drawing up, &c. “To-day ye bearers of water draw up [baptize] none.” Hippocrates, speaking of a certain liquid, says, “When it *drops* upon the garments they are dyed” [baptized.] Observe, the dropping of the liquid is



called baptism. Æschylus says, "This garment, stained [baptized] by the sword of Ægisthus, is a witness unto me." Here the flowing of blood upon a garment is called baptism. Homer, in his battle of the frogs and mice, says, "He fell and breathed no more, and the lake was tinged [baptized] with the purple blood." Was the lake *immersed* in the blood of a MOUSE? Aristophanes says, that Magnes, an old comic poet of Athens, used the Lydian music, and shaved his face, smearing [baptizing] it with tawny brushes." Here the lathering of his face, as when one shaves himself, is called baptizing. Aristotle speaks of a substance which being pressed, stains, [baptizes] the hand. When a man takes a sponge in his hand, and presses it, the water runs upon it; but the hand is not immersed. Ælian speaking of an old coxcomb, says, "He endeavored to conceal the hoariness of his hair, by coloring [baptizing] it." Another example: "You color [baptize] your head, but you can never color [baptize] old age." Aristophanes speaks of a "speckled [baptized] bird," as if we should call a Guinea hen a baptized hen. Marcus Antonius says, "The soul is tinctured [baptized] by the thought."

The Sybilline verse, concerning the city of Athens, is as follows, "THOU MAYEST BE BAPTIZED, O BLADDER, BUT IT IS NOT PERMITTED TO THEE TO GO UNDER THE WATER." Here we have Athens compared to a leathern bottle, or bladder, cast upon the agitated waters, but in spite of the agitation not immersed. This floating upon the water is called baptism. Aristophanes speaks of himself as having been baptized with wine. Here is no immersion; the wine was *poured* into him; and not he plunged into the wine. Josephus, speaking of purification from defilement by a dead body, says, "Having *baptized* some of the ashes, with spring water they sprinkled," &c. Numbers xix. 17, informs us how this was done. "Thou shalt take of the ashes of the burnt heifer, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel, and a clean person shall sprinkle it." Now observe, the command is not to put the ashes into the

water, but the water to the ashes. This mode of applying water is called baptism by Josephus.

Next we will show how the word *is used by Old Testament and Apocryphal writers.* Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 30—"He that is baptized from the touch of a dead body, and again toucheth it, what is he profited by his washing?" Now the process of purifying from this defilement was by sprinkling, by washing the clothes; and this is called baptism. In Judith xii. 7—she is said to have gone out in the night, and baptized herself in the camp, AT [not in] the fountain of water. This of course was not immersion. Ezekiel xxiii. 15—"Exceeding in dyed [baptized] attire." Daniel v. 21—"His body was wet [baptized] with the dew of heaven." It must have been a heavy dew, to have allowed of immersion!

Next follow examples *from the New Testament.* Paul says the Israelites were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea—1 Cor. x. 2. How baptized? In Exodus xiv. 22, we are informed that they went over on dry ground. But in what sense can men be said to be immersed, while walking on dry ground! That they were not immersed is clear. How, then, were they baptized? One of the prophets, alluding to this, says—"And the clouds poured out water." The droppings from the cloud as they were passing, was their baptism, and the only way in which they were wet at all. In Heb. ix. 10, Paul calls the different ceremonial washings done in the tabernacle service, baptisms. Among them all there is not an instance of immersion by the priests. In all cases when the subjects bathed, there was no official administration. For these baptisms, see Lev. viii. 6, and Numb. viii. 7, Lev. xiv. 7, Numb. xix. 13, 17, 18, &c.

Mark vii. 3—"For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash [baptize] *their hands*, they eat not, and when they come from the market, except they wash [baptize] they eat not." Here merely washing the hands is called baptism, and that was usually done by pouring water upon the hands.

Mark vii. 4—"And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing [baptism] of cups, pots, brazen vessels, and couches." These couches were long seats, or beds, on which they reclined; and it would be extraordinary if they immersed their beds! Luke xi. 38—"And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not washed [baptized] before dinner." Acts i. 5, &c.—"Baptized with the Holy Ghost." One is not immersed in the Holy Ghost, but it is poured out upon him.

You see, then, in what different senses the words are used, both by Greek and Jewish writers, *when not applied to a religious rite*. What is the conclusion? *Necessarily* that these words have not a fixed and invariable meaning—that they do not of themselves determine any one particular way of applying a liquid. They are found to be as indeterminate as our word *wash*. When one informs us that he has washed, we suppose that he has made use of water in some way, but cannot tell, from the word employed, in what way. Men wash themselves in *divers* ways. From this investigation of the words, it begins to look as if the apostle was guilty of no impropriety of language, when he spoke of *divers* baptisms.

Let the reader now glance at some suggestions, that will enable him to decide correctly as to the force of these words, when applied to the Christian ordinance.

1. Words taken from a common use, and applied in a special manner to express a religious rite, *must necessarily have a special sense*. They cover a new idea, created by the new institution, and consequently *must* have a new shade of meaning. The idea of Christian Baptism did not exist till our Saviour created it by instituting the rite. This institution gave necessarily a new meaning to the word. As a *religious ceremony*, Baptism is neither immersion nor sprinkling. It stands now for a religious rite—and that rite is water applied religiously in the name of the Trinity. The use of the word



supper confirms these remarks. Like baptism, this is a common word used in a special sense. It has necessarily a new meaning. Eating and drinking as men were accustomed to at supper in those days, would not express the meaning. Bear this in mind. The word supper denotes an ordinary meal; but an ordinary meal is not the Lord's Supper. This Supper is bread and wine used religiously. The word baptism denotes washing in water in *divers* ways; but washing in water is not the Lord's Baptism. This Baptism is *water used religiously in the name of the Trinity*. In these nine words you have the rite, and the whole of it.

2. That this is the meaning attached to the word, and that any particular way of applying water is not essential, may be made still more evident. We have already established the fact that the word baptism signifies the application of a liquid in *divers* ways. Now, then, the question comes—Why has the Holy Ghost made use of a word which designates no one way of using a liquid? Plainly because the manner in which the water is applied, is not essential to the rite, any more than the manner of applying water is essential in a common washing.

3. But further; let the reader inquire whether something may not be gathered from our Saviour's instructions respecting the nature of ceremonial washings, which will throw additional light on the point before us. A single hint from his lips will have weight with every honest searcher after truth. Let Christ be our teacher. Let us value what he has taught us to value, and lay no stress on what he evidently regarded as unimportant. Now when he was washing his disciples' feet, Peter desired him to wash not his feet only. But he replied, "He that is washed [i. e. spiritually cleansed] needeth not, save to wash his feet"—i. e. needs to have a ceremonial washing but partially applied. *Here is a statement of a general principle, with respect to ceremonial washings.*

It shows that our Saviour deemed the quantity of water, and the manner of its application, of no importance.

We shall show, in the following chapter, that if any particular way of applying water is more favored in the Bible than another, and more suitable to the design of baptism, it is sprinkling or pouring.

## CHAPTER II.

### MEANING OF THE WORD CONTINUED. SIGNIFICATION OF BAPTISM.

INQUIRER. Well, Sir, your remarks on the subject of baptism shook my confidence in my former opinions; and wishing to hear both sides, I sought an interview with Mr. —, who made altogether a different impression on my mind.

TEACHER. Pray tell me in what manner he treated the subject.

INQUIRER. He gave me many examples from dictionaries of different languages, and from Greek writers, (for he is quite a scholar,) in which the word baptize signifies to immerse. He quoted also certain distinguished Pedobaptists.

TEACHER. But did he give any cases where it has other significations? In other words, did he allude to any examples where the word means to pour, or simply to wash?

INQUIRER. He did not.

TEACHER. But ought he not to have done this?

INQUIRER. Certainly, if it is ever used in these senses.

TEACHER. We do not deny, my friend, that *baptize* in the original sometimes signifies plunging a substance into a liquid; but we have proved that it also signifies pouring a liquid upon a substance. What then?—We have here a word which denotes the application of water *in divers ways*. If the word therefore denotes the application of water in divers ways, it is indeterminate, like our English word wash, and does not define any one way in which water shall be applied in the reli-

gious rite. This conclusion is immovable. We have sustained it by a multitude of examples cited before; and that all lexicographers concur in it, no intelligent Immerser will deny.

One word as to quotations from distinguished Pedobaptists. They admit that the word means immerse, JUST AS WE HAVE ADMITTED IT IN THESE REMARKS. Now, suppose you should go and report our remarks, in such a manner as to leave the impression that we have conceded that baptize means to immerse, *and nothing else*—would that be honest? No. It would be falsehood under the cloak of truth.\* And we have

\* As an illustration of the truth of this remark, a striking case has occurred while these sheets were going to press. The editor of the Christian Watchman has published an article to show that the word "*baptize means immerse, and nothing else.*" And how does he show it? He quotes lexicons to the number of twenty-two, after this fashion:—

"*Baptizo*, properly *immergo ac intingo in aquam mergo*; to immerse, to dip, to plunge into water.'—*Schleusner's Lex.*

"*Baptizo*, in its primary and radical sense—I cover with water. It is used to denote, 1st—I plunge or sink completely under water.'—*Ewing's Lex.*

"*Bapto*, to dip in, to immerse; *Baptizo*, to submerge, sink.'—*E. Robinson's Lex.*

"*Bapto*, to dip, to plunge into water; *Baptizo*, to immerse.'—*J. Donegan's Lex.*"

We have taken the trouble to examine the authors above named, and have been astonished at the glaring injustice which has been done to them. We suppose, that, were we to examine the whole list, we should find most or all of them used in the same way. Let the reader take notice that these authors are represented by the editor as saying that the *only meaning* of the word is to immerse, dip, or plunge. He will then be surprised to learn, *that they all give other significations*, as follows:—

SCHLEUSNER says, the word means *abluo, lavo, aquâ purgo*; i. e. to perform ablution, to wash, to purge with water, and also imbue.

ROBINSON says—"In the New Testament it means—to wash, to perform ablution, to cleanse—also to tinge, to dye," &c.

DONEGAN says, it means to wash, to dye—to dye one's hair.

been pained at this disingenuous dealing of many writers in favor of immersion. They have abused the minds of their

EWING says—"In its primary and radical sense, it means to cover with water, or some other fluid, in whatever manner this is done; whether by immersion or affusion, wholly or partially, permanently or for a moment. Hence the word is USED IN SEVERAL DIFFERENT SENSES. It is used to denote to plunge, or sink completely under water—to cover partially with water—to wet—to cover with water flowing or pouring upon—to wash in general, without specifying the mode—to wash for the special purpose of symbolical, ritual, or ceremonial purification." He gives examples of the use of the word:—"He that is washed [baptized] from [the pollution of] a dead body, and again toucheth it, what profit hath he by his washing?"—Sirach xxxi. 25, or xxxiv. 25. When this passage is compared with Num. xix. 9—22, it will appear, that baptize is used by the apocryphal writer for the application of the *water of sprinkling*. \* \* \* \* \* It may here be observed that ceremonial purification by immersion was always performed by the unclean person himself, (and indeed decency required this; as this kind of purification never appears to have been the immersing of persons with their clothes on,) *but that the mode was always different, when the purification was administered by another*. It is in this sense that baptize, when employed in the New Testament, is almost always used." He further says, that—"To maintain, as some have done, that baptize, when thus applied, ought always to be rendered plunge, dip, immerse, or wash, betrays inattention to its real force and import."

Thus speak the lexicographers, whom the Watchman represents as saying that "*baptize means immerse, and nothing else*." It will be seen that he makes them say that, by suppressing what they do say. After quoting his twenty-two lexicons, after this fashion, the Watchman utters this remarkable sentence:—"These are but specimens of the unanimous testimony of scholars and lexicographers, not one of whom ever gave the word the definition of *sprinkling, pouring, or keel-hauling*."

Mark it—he says not one of these "*ever gave the word the definition of sprinkling*;" whereas Ewing expressly says it is used, in a case referred to by him, for the *application of the water of sprinkling*. He further says that to maintain what the Watchman does maintain, "betrays inattention to its force and import." And yet the Watch-

unlearned readers, by a sort of false dealing which puts a part of the truth in place of the whole.

INQUIRER. It seems strange to me, that so many Christians who are sincere and honest, and many of them highly intelligent, should contend that this word signifies only immersion, if there is no more foundation for their opinion than what now appears.

TEACHER. And does it not seem equally strange, that a much greater number of good men, equally honest, sincere and intelligent, should so positively deny that assumption, if there is no foundation for their denial? Though we protest against the use of human authority in such a question as this, it is fair to meet human authority with human authority. And let us ask, who were the translators of our English Bible? This translation was completed by a galaxy of minds, read in the languages to an extent which few scholars now attain. And on this subject they followed the track struck

man quotes him, as supporting what he thus expressly disclaims! Now let us ask, in the fear of God, how do such mistakes, put forth by scores in a single article, occur? That the editor would wilfully deceive the public, we may not believe. But we should not like to risk what little credit we have for scholarship, or moral probity, on such a declaration. It is a painful fact, that the Immersers' cause has for several generations been sustained by just such assertions, respecting authorities, right in the face of those authorities. We can well see why Immersers are so anxious to sustain such a declaration; for their cause rests upon it. If the word has one other meaning, *their whole fabric falls*. They choose to appeal to lexicons. This is but a secondary source of evidence. But after having proved our point from original sources, we have followed them to the lexicons, which they have selected, and find that every one, so far as we have consulted, disagrees with them; and that their quotations are perversions. If, by saying that these authors agree with them, they mean that these authors say *that immersion is one of the meanings*; very well; we agree with them. But it happens that they bring the quotations to show that the word *has no other meaning*; and as to this point, *not one agrees with them*.



out by the martyr Tyndal, and by his successors equally worthy. Why did they not thus translate? Do you say, because they were Pedobaptists? But why were they Pedobaptists?—were they so against their honest convictions? And had not they the means of knowing? They could use the Greek and Latin as freely as their mother tongue. Tyndal was in fact the author, and his successors the endorsers, of this translation of the word. Was Tyndal “*afraid to take up the cross,*” and go down the banks of Jordan? He was not afraid to go to the stake in defence of his translation; for he did it.

INQUIRER. I have understood that the Greek church practise immersion; and are they not good authority on such a question?

TEACHER. We see not how they, in their deep ignorance, have any better sources of knowledge, as to a rite established among Jews, than we have. They have vied with the Papal church in corruptions, in superstitions, and in placing undue stress on outward ceremonies. And as baptizing by immersion is one instance of departure from the simplicity of the Gospel, it is very natural that they should have adopted it. Though they do not lay as much stress on that mode as our Immersers do, for they do not always practise it; and are therefore *against the principle that it is essential to baptism.* So that while the Greek church immerse, and sometimes immerse three times, they are against the principles of our Immersers. And if we are to suppose them to be better authority than others on this subject, we see not why we must not pay them the same deference on other subjects. If we begin to copy their corruptions, we know not where to end.

Our object is, to ascertain the meaning attached to the word *baptize* by the sacred writers. Now, if it were true that its literal meaning were immerse, and that this was invariably its signification among the ancient Greeks, (whose authority

in this matter must take the precedence of their degenerate descendants,) it would not follow that it must necessarily be employed in this sense by the writers of the Bible. When words pass from one country to another, and from a profane vocabulary into the sacred, their signification is often very much modified, and sometimes entirely changed. The literal meaning of the word *spirit*, for example, is *wind*; but who will argue from this fact that it has no other signification in the inspired writings? Every scholar knows that the Scripture phraseology is peculiar. Hence the Bible is the only safe interpreter of Bible words. When therefore it is remembered, that the word baptize has different meanings in the Greek classics, and is used BY THE WRITERS OF THE BIBLE WHEN THEY COULD NOT HAVE MEANT BY IT IMMERSION, we see nothing authoritative in the practice of the modern Greek church—corrupt, superstitious, and pleased with religious toys.

INQUIRER. My mind has been so long accustomed to associate immersion with the sound of baptism, that, even when my understanding is convinced, it seems to me like a perversion of terms to call pouring baptism.

TEACHER. It is unquestionably difficult to rid the mind of early impressions. Nor, indeed, can we expect to do it instantly. The influence of erroneous views, once entertained, will be felt in the workings of the imagination, long after the higher powers of the mind have pronounced them false. But, my friend, did Homer pervert his own language, when he spoke of a lake *baptized* with the blood of a mouse? Did Plutarch pervert the word, when he called that a *baptized* bladder, which he said did not and could not go under water? If such writers could call the pouring of a liquid on a substance *baptism*, it is certainly arrogance in us moderns to oppose our fancy to their knowledge. And, furthermore, if this use of the word did not offend the taste of inspired men, if the apostle Paul did not scruple to call (Heb. ix. 10) the



typical cleansings of the Jewish economy, *baptisms*, (Lev. iv. 6; xvii. 6; Num. xix. 18; Lev. vii. 14; Num. xix. 21; Lev. xiv. 7, 51, &c.) when almost every case was performed by *sprinkling*, why should you feel any difficulty? Is not his authority to be relied on? Nay, if God himself speaks of the *outpourings* of his Spirit as *baptism*, and thereby teaches us that He is satisfied with this use of the term, why should you not be?

INQUIRER. With whatever confidence immersion has been pronounced to be the only meaning of the word *baptize*, the evidence certainly preponderates in your favor. Never could I exclude from the Lord's table Christian brethren, for venturing to use this word as God uses it! But must I understand you to hold that our Saviour has left the mode of baptism wholly undefined?

TEACHER. If the way of applying water in the rite constitutes the mode of baptism, he has left it undefined. But this is not the mode. *Religious* baptism is water applied religiously in the name of the Trinity. So much *is* essential—so much *is* defined. He who makes anything more essential to the ordinance, does it at his peril. He introduces an occasion of discord into the church of Christ. And by teaching for doctrines the commandments of men, he takes the responsibility of engendering strife and confusion in the house of God. To add to the commands of God, and to insist that our additions are God's commands, is as injurious to men and offensive to God, as to take away what he has commanded—as may be seen in the mammoth corruptions of the Romish church, which consist as much in additions as in subtractions.

INQUIRER. But may we not suppose that some one way is better than another? And is it not more significant to plunge the subject into the water?

TEACHER. That depends upon WHAT BAPTISM SIGNIFIES. And this brings up an important principle. If we can dis-

cover what is the thing signified by baptism, that will help us to determine the most *significant* way. And surely the Bible has not left this matter in darkness—for unless one knows what the rite signifies, he would not know what exercises of mind he should have when he presents himself for baptism; i. e. would not know how to obey the command to be baptized.

INQUIRER. This is a plain matter. If baptism can be shown to signify anything into which men are immersed, that would go far to prove immersion to be the way; and on the other hand, if it signifies any influences that are uniformly spoken of as poured out or sprinkled upon men, then pouring or sprinkling would be more significant. The type should correspond to the antitype.

TEACHER. *Baptism is an emblem of the work of the Holy Spirit on the human soul.* So Paul seems to teach, Eph. v. 25—“Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water [i. e. baptism, for Christ has no other washing of water] by the word.” Here was the sanctifying and the cleansing, the antitype and the type. Again—“According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.” That is, we are saved by that regeneration, or sanctifying influence of the Spirit of God, of which the washing of water is an emblem. Again—“Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water.” Here the washing of the body with pure water (or baptism, the only religious washing) is joined with the thing signified by it—a heart sprinkled or purified. Again—“The like figure whereunto, baptism, doth now save us, not the putting off the filth of the flesh, [i. e. not the mere outward cleansing by baptismal water,] but the answer of a good conscience,”—that is, our being purified, so that we live with a good conscience.

Again—"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Now why are water and the Spirit thus connected, if the water (i. e. baptism) be not an emblem of the Spirit? Surely the water is not a co-agent with the Spirit in the new birth. Again, here is a passage still more decisive. Acts xxii. 16—"Arise, be baptized, and wash away thy sins." How can baptism wash away sins? In no way, except it be as a symbol of washing, the thing to be proved.

Further—the work of the Holy Spirit is called baptism in many places, which any one may see for himself. And what can be more decisive? Prof. Stuart, on this subject, observes—"Under the ancient dispensation the rites were divided into two great classes, viz., *those significant of purification, and those significant of atonement for sin.* Nothing could be more appropriate than this. Man needed the one, and the other, in order to find acceptance with God: the one is the work of the Spirit, and the other of the Saviour who redeemed us by his blood. Is there any change in the *essential* conditions of salvation, under the new dispensation? None, we must answer. Are not the significant symbols, then, under the new dispensation, a summary of those which existed under the old? The belief of this spontaneously forces itself upon my mind. The work of the Spirit is still symbolized under the Gospel, and a Savior's blood is still represented—the one baptism signifies, the other is as plainly indicated by the Lord's Supper."

Our object is here to show, in brief, the close connection between the baptism of the Spirit and baptism with water, and that the one is a symbol of the other. Now if baptism by water is an emblem of baptism by the Spirit, we have only to look into the Bible and see in what way we are brought into contact with the influences of the Spirit? If we are currently represented as being put into the Spirit, or plunged into the Spirit, we concede the whole matter in question; and if, on

the other hand, the Spirit is currently said to be poured out upon us, or sprinkled upon us, then you must concede that pouring or sprinkling is the more *significant* way. We proceed, then, to quote some instances:—"I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground. I will *pour my Spirit* upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring"—Isa. 44. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; and I will put my Spirit within you, [not put you into my Spirit] and cause you to walk in my statutes." "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh"—Joel ii. 28. "Until the Spirit be poured out"—Isaiah xxxii. 15. "For I have poured out my Spirit"—Ezekiel xxxix. 29.

Next take some examples from the New Testament. John saw the Spirit descending, and lighting upon Jesus—Matt. iii. 16. The Holy Ghost *fell on* all them which heard the word; and Peter's friends "were astonished, because that on the Gentiles was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost"—Acts x. "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost *fell on them*, as on us at the beginning; *then remembered I the words of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.*"

We have thus given a few specimens, to show that the Holy Ghost is said "to fall" upon men, to be "poured out" upon them. And it is in reference to this subject, that God promises "to sprinkle clean water upon us," and that his grace shall "come down as rain upon the mown grass, and as showers which water the earth." It is of no consequence, however, as to the point before us, whether these things are said in connection with baptism or not. They are brought simply to show in what manner the Scriptures speak of the communication of the Spirit's influences. Now, then, if the thing signified is uniformly represented as sprinkled, or poured out, upon the subject, that which signifies *it* may be pouring or sprinkling. Indeed, "it is by no means probable that God

should speak of his own operations one way, and symbolically represent them in a different way ; that he should promise to sprinkle or pour out his Spirit upon us, and to confirm this promise would command us to be plunged into water. There would be no analogy, in this case, between the promise and the seal ; and the discrepancy would give rise to a confusion of ideas. This I conceive to be an argument of considerable force in favor of our mode of administering baptism, and an objection against immersion which cannot be easily evaded."

*Dick. Theol.*

## CHAPTER III.

### BURIAL WITH CHRIST. ITS IMPORT.

IN our last chapter we set forth the design of baptism, and showed conclusively that it is to represent the work of the Holy Spirit upon the soul, and that his influences are invariably represented as coming down, either sprinkled or poured, upon the subject. And the inquirer will recollect the admitted principle, that the type and antitype should correspond.

We are aware that Immersers make baptism to be a sign of fellowship with Christ in his burial, and to be the main design. This view they found upon two passages—Romans vi. and Colossians ii. 12. A glance at these passages, in their connection, will show that great difficulties, at least, stand in the way of this conclusion.

The first question is, whether these two passages more clearly teach that burial is the grand design, than those numerous passages which we have quoted teach that purification is the grand design. Let the inquirer look over those passages, and compare. And in this connection we will observe, that the two ideas of burial in a grave and purification by water are incongruous. *Both cannot be held.* Purity contrasts with the corruption and filth of the grave.

2. But supposing this difficulty surmounted, another presents itself. Before Immersers can draw their inference, it must be proved that the apostle in these passages refers to *water baptism*. Their whole argument rests on this assumption—and yet it is a mere assumption. And if it should turn out that the apostle means by baptism a spiritual purification,



(i. e. a spiritual baptism,) as most surely he does, then all semblance of an argument from these texts would vanish ; for we have seen how spiritual baptism is performed.

3. This difficulty being surmounted, another comes. It is a question not so easily settled, as to what the likeness shall be. If the reader will turn to the passage, he will see that there is a comparison with death, with crucifixion, with burial, &c. Suppose we insist that baptism shall imitate the form of Christ's death, and not his burial, (for surely the two things are very distinct,) what would the Immersers say? Paul says, BAPTIZED INTO HIS DEATH ; and if the passage is in any way decisive of the mode of water baptism—if this reasoning from it is conclusive—it concludes both ways : that baptism must imitate crucifixion, or at least, after the Papists' mode, bear the sign of the cross ; and must also imitate his burial.

4. This difficulty being surmounted, another comes. How shall we baptize in a way to imitate a burial? Nations have various modes of burial, but in no case do they bury by thrusting the body through the soil. The common modes of burial are more like pouring or sprinkling. The body is placed in an open grave, and the earth is poured or sprinkled upon it. The classical emblem has been (*jactus pulveris*) a handful of earth tossed in the air. Our Episcopal friends represent a burial by sprinkling earth upon the coffin.

5. This difficulty being surmounted, another comes. If baptism must imitate the form of any burial, it must imitate that of Christ ; and Christ was not buried in the common way. His body was not sunk in the ground, but merely laid away on a shelf in a chamber of an excavated rock.

These are some of the difficulties that meet any intelligent mind, on the first glance at the subject. In order to set this subject well before the mind, we will state *the true meaning of the apostle, and then point out the sources of the Immersers'*

*error.* The two passages are alike. Take the case in Romans: what is the drift of Paul's remarks? He is showing that the doctrines of grace do not warrant one to continue in sin, that grace may abound. He is attributing to the baptism of which he speaks, *effects which water baptism is inadequate to produce.* His main idea is, that such is the nature of a union with Christ,—a union brought about by the purification of the heart, i. e. spiritual baptism,—that to speak of those thus baptized continuing in sin, is as great a contradiction as to speak of a living dead man. “Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?” Mark the effects which he attributes to the baptism of which he speaks. This baptism is followed *necessarily by death to sin.* It is not enough to say, such *ought to be* dead to sin; *the certainty* that they will be is essential to the argument. Indeed, the argument is good for nothing without ABSOLUTE CERTAINTY. Now does that certainty follow water baptism? Far from it. It follows spiritual baptism, and no other.

It is as if he had said—How shall they who have received spiritual baptism, (in other words, who have been brought into spiritual union with Christ,) continue in sin? They are united to Christ in his death to the world. Taking fire at the thought, he gives utterance to his feelings in a variety of strong expressions of the certainty of that death, and consequent insensibility to the inducements to continue in sin. “What is the effect of *natural* dissolution? Is it not the interruption of all our former appetites? What is the condition of a man buried? Does he hunger or thirst any more? Will beauty move his love? Will the tabret or the harp, the richest wines or the most luxuriant viands, entice him beyond the bounds of temperance? Load the coffin with gold, clothe the skeleton with scarlet and ermine; will this awaken his avarice, or will these elevate his pride? Surely, if the soul perceives at all the objects which surround her recent



dwelling, she perceives them but to recognise their utter vanity, and to feel that these are not the things which can any longer contribute to her happiness!" Such are *the effects* of that death to sin which follows a union with Christ; and in this sense the apostle says of true Christians, that they are crucified, dead, and buried.

The above remarks make it clear, that the passage in Romans refers to a *spiritual baptism* and purification, and can decide nothing as to the form in which water is to be applied.

The passage in Colossians still more clearly bears this meaning. Read it. "In whom also ye are circumcised, with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Now here observe that the Colossians are said to have been circumcised in Christ, and to be buried with him in baptism, and in such a way, as to show that the circumcision and baptism refer to the same thing. That the circumcision imports a spiritual purification is certain; for it is a circumcision *made without hands, in putting off the body of sin*. And if the circumcision is a purification made without hands, most surely is the baptism one made without hands; for both are put in the same relations, and import the same thing. And, further, they are said to be buried with Christ in baptism, and then *risen* with him through faith of the operation of God. Now, *as is the burial, so is the resurrection*. *If it is a literal burial in the water, the resurrection is a literal rising out of the water*. But they had risen through faith of the operation of God. Yet persons immersed do not thus rise by faith. The passage then, by necessity, imports a death to sin, and a resurrection to newness of life; and has no reference to the outward application of water, and determines nothing as to the manner in which water should be applied.

Now, having given the true meaning of the apostle in these passages, we are prepared to examine the sources of the Immersers' error, touching them.

1. The first source of error is *the imagination*. The person has heard these words so frequently repeated at the immersion of individuals, that they have made an impression upon his mind, and he *fancies* some analogy between immersion and Christ's burial. Few are aware how much imagination has to do with this subject, and how much impression has been made by pictorial representations. And as error has been promoted in that way, may not the friends of truth learn a lesson as to their duty of securing the imagination on the side of truth? And why should not our children be taught, by arguments addressed to the eye, the analogy between the falling drops of water and the influences of the Spirit, which are represented as coming down like the rain upon the grass?

2. The second source of error is *a literal understanding of the apostle's language*. Now, if the *burying* is to be taken literally, so also the other phrases must be, such as death, crucified, planted, &c. Mark it, if the burial is literal, the death is literal also. If there must be a literal burial, there *must be a literal death!!!* Again, *the effects*, as we have already seen, are such as *water baptism* cannot produce. These brief hints are sufficient to satisfy every intelligent reader that the literal interpretation cannot be maintained.

3. Among those who admit a figurative sense, there is another source of error. The figure must have a basis; and some say, that, *unless it is founded on some outward form, it can have no basis*. Why use the figure *buried*, they ask, if the apostle had not in his mind's eye something which *looked* like burial? We answer: The mind, in framing figurative language, as frequently fixes on the *effects* produced, as upon any outward circumstance. For example, Cicero said of the conspiracy of Cataline, which he had crushed—"It is *dead*,

*carried out, and buried.*" His mind in framing that figure was not upon a funeral, or a grave, or a burial; but upon the *effects* of the death, to wit, the utter cessation of all trouble from the conspiracy. So we say of a man condemned to the penitentiary for life, that he is dead to society, and buried. Why use that figure? It has nothing that *looks* like a burial for its basis. This also is based on certain effects resulting from death and burial. While bishop Butler was living in an obscure village, one inquired if he was dead. "No," another replied, "but he is *buried.*" Why use that figure? Why not contend here that there was something in the author's eye that *looked* like a burial? The figure was based on one of the effects of a burial, in that he was forgotten by the world. By this time, the inquirer will see that figures of this kind may be used, without the most distant allusion to anything that *looks* like a burial.

Now then, when Paul said of Christians, that they were dead, buried, and crucified with Christ, it is easy to see that he had only certain *results* in his mind. He meant only to say, that as Christ, when buried, was insensible to this world, so are those, who are spiritually in union with him, dead to the inducements to continue in sin.

4. Another source of this error lies in taking *a part for the whole of the apostle's comparison in these texts.* The Immer-ser feels bound to imitate Christ in only one of the particulars of the figurative representation, while consistency would require him to go through and to make the form of his baptism correspond to all the other particulars. If the form of baptism must imitate the burial of Christ, much more must it be *a baptism into death*; for the text is even more strong in that particular. It says, "as many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized *into his death.*" Now, the same rule that would require a literal burial, would require *a literal death.* And then, if in baptism we must imitate the form of Christ's burial, we must, for the same reason, imitate also

the form of his death ; that is, his crucifixion. We must not only be actually put to death before our burial, but we must be put to death on a cross, since the text lays even more stress on the crucifixion and the death, than it does on the burial. And to carry faithfully out this mode of interpreting the passage, our baptism must imitate not only the mode of burial, but also that of *planting* ; for the text also says, “ we have been *planted* together in the likeness of his death.” So we see the Immersers’ error comes from fixing on one part of the comparison, and overlooking other parts quite as important.

5. Still another source of error is *a neglect of making the several parts of the comparison correspond with each other*. For instance, in the passage in Romans, the resurrection following the burial is a spiritual one ; a resurrection to “ newness of life.” Of course, the death and burial preceding must be a death and burial to sin, and not a burial under water. So in Colossians, the resurrection is a rising “ through faith of the operation of God,” and not through the strength of the baptizer’s arm. And yet the Immerser fails to see that that should be a spiritual burial that goes before and corresponds with such a spiritual resurrection. He fails also to make the baptism and the circumcision, both representing one effect, to correspond with each other, as we have shown.

6. But the main source of error on this subject consists *in overlooking altogether the main design of the rite of baptism*. We have shown, in a former article, that its main design is, to represent the outpouring upon us of the purifying and the sanctifying influences of the Spirit. And though the Scriptures are so full on this point, as we have shown, yet Immersers are loth to allow this at all ; and if they do allow it, they will have it that the main design is to represent a burial. And yet, strange as it may seem, THE SCRIPTURES SAY NOTHING OF ANY SUCH DESIGN ; AND DO NOT EVEN HINT AT IT, unless these two passages contain the hint ; and these, as we

have shown beyond all ground for doubt, have no reference to water baptism at all.

Another source of error touching these passages consists in overlooking the fact, *that being buried cannot be made an act of duty; while receiving baptism supposes an act of obedience; and supposes a mind apprehending the design of baptism, and recognising the truth symbolized by the rite; and at the time of receiving the rite surrendering the heart to the sway of that truth.* Now if the rite imports our need of the purifying influence of the Holy Spirit—if it be the sign and seal of our surrender of ourselves to God in the covenant of grace, and receiving the seal of the Spirit of grace, the mind may well correspond with this design, in the act of receiving the rite. And even if it imported our *death to sin*, the spirit of obedience while receiving the rite might go forth in a surrender of ourselves to death, and in a pledge of dying to sin and living to God. But if the design is made to consist in a *burial*, the spirit of obedience cannot touch it. As one is supposed *to be dead before he is buried*, he cannot exercise obedience in submitting to a burial. Christ performed his highest act of obedience when he yielded to death on the cross; but he did no act of obedience when his corpse was taken and laid away in Joseph's family vault. The martyrs have put forth a glorious spirit of obedience, when they have yielded to the stroke of the executioner; but they had nothing to do in what concerned their corpses afterwards—they did *not obey in being buried*. The burial is supposed *to be wholly the act of others*; and in respect to it the person buried is wholly insensible. In what state of mind then must one receive the rite, in order to have his feelings at the time correspond to the design of the ordinance? If the posture and treatment of the body must imitate a burial, what, we ask, must be the exercises of mind in the mean time, in order to conform to this? and the answer should be—*none at all*; since the person buried has no consciousness of his burial.



Yet it is very essential, when we come to the sealing ordinances, that the mind work in harmony with the design of the ordinance. When we come to the Lord's table, we are required by faith to discern the Lord's body. And why is it not as important in baptism, that the mind fasten on the design of the ordinance, and feel the promptings of a holy obedience in correspondence with it? Yet if burial be that design, a spirit of obedience cannot reach it, unless we suppose the absurdity of being buried alive. This consideration of itself is sufficient to determine that the design of baptism is not that of burial.

So that the very first principle of the Immersers' theory, to wit, that baptism was designed to imitate a burial, is an assumption without a shadow of foundation. And not only has it a mere guess for its basis, and for its whole superstructure, but it involves the absurdity of supposing a spirit of obedience to animate a corpse in its burial.

It would protract this chapter to an inconvenient length, should we here commence the examination of the actual cases of baptism recorded in the New Testament, and show, as we intend, that **THERE IS NO CASE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT IN WHICH THE BAPTISM MIGHT NOT HAVE BEEN BY SPRINKLING OR POURING, AND MANY CASES IN WHICH IT COULD NOT HAVE BEEN BY IMMERSION.**

## CHAPTER IV.

INQUIRER. Your remarks on those passages which speak of a burial with Christ by baptism, presented the subject in a light which was new to me. That the apostle is speaking of *spiritual baptism* is clear from this fact alone, that he represents it as bringing the soul into sympathy with Christ in his indifference to the world; *which effect does not follow water baptism*. Although this has been my opinion for some time, I have all along supposed that the figurative expression, "buried with Christ," must have its basis in something external, which looked like a burial. This I am now ready to confess was a childish fancy. We notice in Paul's writings a very frequent use of the figures of being dead, crucified, &c., in a way in which he could have had in his mind's eye only *an effect* of death, crucifixion, &c. And if any one will watch the workings of his mind when using this class of figures, I think he will be convinced, that the mind *generally* has before it some one or more of *the effects* of death, and *very rarely* anything which looks like a corpse, a funeral, or a grave. I remember that one of our missionaries, just as he was leaving his native shores never to return, said to a friend at parting, "I have buried my friends alive." Now evidently here was no allusion to any *external mode of burying*, but simply to *one effect* of being buried, viz., that he was never to see his friends again.

This all seems plain so far. And as this has been the main point with me, I see not but that I must admit that the Scriptures are far from making it clear that immersion is essential to baptism. But as you say that the Scriptures lay no great



stress upon the mode in which water is applied, would it not be best for all to practise immersion, in order to promote harmony among Christians, by meeting tender consciences on their own ground?

TEACHER. We have many serious objections to immersion, which we could state if it were necessary. True christian harmony never can be promoted by departing from a mode evidently scriptural, to adopt one which has originated in the fancy of minds morbidly inclined to lay an undue stress on an external rite. This method of harmonizing with those superstitiously inclined, gave rise to the corruptions of the Romish church. We object more to immersion than to any other mode of applying water, *because it is further from the main design of baptism.* The Scriptures, as we have seen, represent baptism as an emblem of purification by the influences of the Holy Spirit, which influences are uniformly described as *poured out upon us.* Now when the Scriptures invariably represent the spiritual influences *as sprinkled or poured upon the subject,* for us to *put the subject into the symbolic water,* would seem to be too great a departure from the scriptural mode. We object to immersion, *because it is a literal washing.* That is certainly the best symbol which strikes the mind at once *as merely a symbol,* and from its very simplicity compels it to pass beyond it to the thing signified. Not to multiply objections, we could not repeat our baptism to meet the demands of Immersers; nor could we apply the screws of close communion, and unchurch those of our brethren who should not see fit to go with us. So that, even if we should allow those who have not been baptized to be immersed, we could not harmonize with the exclusive principle of Immersers. This principle constitutes the very basis of their denominational existence. It is the ligament which binds them together. And you see it is one of very serious import and consequences.

INQUIRER. True—such a principle ought not to be adopted, but for imperious reasons. No one certainly can be justified

in adopting it, except on grounds which are set clear from every reasonable doubt.

TEACHER. How strange, then, appears their position, and how high the arrogance of their pretensions—how causeless the discords which they thrust into the house of God, when it is so evident that the entire basis and structure of their argument is composed of nothing but *guesses!*

INQUIRER. That is a strong expression.

TEACHER. But no more strong than true. When, for example, Immersers speak so confidently of the apostles immersing their converts, it is, to say the least, but a guess.

INQUIRER. But is it not more than a guess that John immersed his converts?

#### JOHN'S BAPTISM.

TEACHER. You are a little too fast. John was not one of *the apostles*, nor was his baptism the *Christian rite*. And here, by the way, you see that a guess lies *at the very foundation* of the Immerser's argument. In order to get the supposed benefit of John's practice, it is *guessed* that John's baptism was Christian baptism. And one single passage of Scripture spoils this guess at once. Paul at Ephesus, (Acts xix.) "finding certain disciples," said to them, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism." After some instructions, showing the different intent of John's baptism, "they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." That the baptism which they received from John was not Christian baptism, appears from the fact that they *never had heard* of the Holy Ghost, and of course could not have been baptized in his name. And, furthermore, it is not to be supposed that John baptized in the name of Jesus, for he would

not have baptized Jesus in the name of Jesus. But to put the question beyond all doubt, *the apostle did not consider them as having received the Christian rite, as is evident from the fact that he baptized them.* It would be superfluous to give other reasons. Here is *Scripture* against a *guess*!

But suppose we give them the advantage of that guess, and, for the sake of argument, allow that John's baptism is to be taken as a guide for us:—how do they arrive at the *certainty* that he immersed? In every step of their argument they proceed by guesses. They say that he immersed, because the word baptize means to immerse, and nothing else. But we have already proved that this word has various shades of meaning, and does not define any particular way of applying water. Here then is one guess. They say that he immersed, because he went to the Jordan for this purpose. But were there *no other reasons* for resorting thither? If we could conceive of no necessity for his seeking some such place as the region about Jordan, except for the convenience of immersing, then the inference which Immersers draw from this circumstance would appear more plausible. On the other hand, *if there was an equal necessity for the selection of such a place, whether he baptized by affusion or immersion*, then this circumstance proves nothing in favor of any particular mode of baptism. Let us now examine the facts. John was a field preacher, and we read that he came *preaching* in the wilderness. *The immense multitudes that flocked together to hear him, made it necessary* for him to withdraw from the narrow streets of the cities, to the open country in the neighborhood of Jordan; and that, being the place of his preaching, would naturally be the place of his baptizing. You see, then, that *necessity* compelled him to select an open country, *for other purposes* than immersion. Who can say that those other purposes were not the sole cause of his withdrawing from the cities and villages? This is at least possible. And if it be only possible, the Immerser's *certainty* is instantly converted

into a *guess*. But we contend that it is highly probable. Nay, there are other circumstances connected with John's ministry, which we are bound to take into consideration, and which render the guess that he immersed perfectly incredible. We read that "there went out to him Jerusalem, and *all* Judea, and *all* the region round about Jordan, and *were baptized of him.*" If in a papal country some new ceremony should come into vogue, attracting that absorbing interest which John's baptism did, few of the people would fail to rush forward with the multitude, to receive the advantage of it. *The Jews were even more disposed to value outward ceremonies than the Papists* It is therefore certain that immense multitudes flocked to John's baptism. The passage of Scripture which I have quoted, interpreted by the circumstances, cannot import less than 500,000. Suppose that he immersed one every minute—to have immersed 500,000, he must have stood breast high in the water, twelve hours every day, for nearly two whole years. But his ministry was little more than a year and a half, and during part of that time he was in prison! Where is the man, however, who could remain in the water twelve hours every day successively, for even one year? or where is the man who could immerse sixty persons an hour, for twelve hours in succession, and repeat the process every day for a year? We read (John x. 41) that "John did no miracle." But if John did this, his entire life was one prodigious miracle! Perhaps you may say that 500,000 are more, probably, than went out to him. Very well—take the smallest number which, in your opinion, the record will warrant, and you will not escape from this difficulty. When we consider the brief duration of John's ministry, the time he must necessarily have spent in preaching, his imprisonment, the time needed to recruit his exhausted bodily powers, the days of the year when he could not have immersed, &c., we are fully satisfied that he could not have immersed 80,000. It is, therefore, wholly incredible, that the immense multitudes which he baptized

could have been immersed. If he baptized, however, according to the custom of the priests, and took a bunch of hyssop and sprinkled the people as they passed him, he could have done it.

Now, viewing *all* the circumstances in the case, where is the *certainty* that John immersed? The confident assumption of Immersers in regard to his practice, is a guess against, to say the least, the strongest probability.

INQUIRER. But did not John baptize in Enon, because there was much water there?

TEACHER. It requires *one guess* to establish the conclusion that he went there *for the sake of immersing*. We say that there are *other and more probable reasons* why he chose that place. He would not need much water, or "many waters," i. e. many streams or springs of water, (as it is in the Greek,) for immersing. For that purpose, one stream would suffice. Why did he need *many* streams? why was it necessary for him to select a place watered with *many* springs? This is the question which presses upon us for an answer. Now it is certain that he could not have chosen such a place for immersion. The simple fact that the word is *plural*, (*many* streams or springs,) decides *this* point. One man could not immerse in *many* places at once, nor could he *need many* rivulets or springs for that purpose. Why, then, must this field preacher go to Enon, a place well supplied with springs? Because it was no easy matter to find water in that region, to accommodate the thousands that came to him, with their camels and other beasts. Enon, furnished with many springs, afforded rare conveniences for a camp-meeting, assembled to remain many days. So that, in whatever way he baptized, *there were other and more important reasons, for his selection of that place, than the convenience of immersing*.

INQUIRER. I see clearly, that to base the duty of immersion on such a foundation, is to base it on a guess. We surely cannot maintain that a man is influenced in the choice



of a spot by one particular reason, when *other and better reasons* are known to exist.

TEACHER. And when, too, that particular reason, as in this case, does not answer the question why he needed *many* springs or streams.

INQUIRER. Very true. But is there not a better foundation for the assumption that our Saviour was baptized by immersion?

#### CHRIST'S BAPTISM.

TEACHER. It requires *one guess* to reach the conclusion that Christ is our example in baptism. John's baptism was a *Jewish* rite, under the *old* dispensation. What have *we* to do with it? Before we can feel bound ourselves to follow Christ in the observance of a *Jewish* ceremony, or at liberty to impose any such duty upon others, we must have at least *some proof* that he *designed* this act for our imitation. But not the shadow of such proof exists. On the contrary, the guess of Immersers implies such a gross misconception of *the design* of our Saviour's baptism,—a misconception so plainly in the face of Scripture,—that when we hear them speak with so much confidence of "Jordan's floods," and of "following Christ into the water," we literally blush for them. *Christ's baptism was his introduction into the priest's office.* The Mosaic law required every priest, when thirty years of age, (Num. iv. 3, 23, 30, 35,) to be consecrated to their sacred work by being washed with water. (Lev. viii. 6.) As a symbol of the anointing of the Holy Spirit, they were also anointed with oil. Now mark the coincidences. When Jesus came to John, he was about thirty years old, (Luke iii. 21, 23,) and was just about entering upon his office as priest;—after baptism he was anointed by the descent of the Holy Ghost, and commenced immediately his public duties. The apostle Paul tells us, (Heb. v. 5,) that Christ did not glorify himself to be made a high priest, but he that said unto him, "Thou art

my Son; this day have I begotten thee." Here it is expressly said that *the Father glorified him by making him a high priest*, when he said, "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." And this was said at his baptism. (Matt. iii. 17.)

An examination of Scripture compels us, *either to admit that this was the design of Christ's baptism, or deny that he fulfilled all righteousness*. His words to John (Matt. iii. 15) imply that *some law then existing*, and which he was bound to fulfil, made it proper for him to be baptized. But what law? Not the law of *Christian baptism*, for the rite itself did not at that time exist. Not *the moral law*, for Christ was no sinner: and no violations of that code made it necessary for him to receive the baptism of repentance. To what law then did he refer? Unquestionably to *the ceremonial law*, which is nothing to us, but which he was born under, and bound to fulfil. There was something in that law, as his own words imply, which made it necessary for him to be baptized. To that law, therefore, we must go for instruction, if we would obtain scriptural views of *the design* of his baptism. Now in that code we find a statute requiring every priest to be consecrated by the washing of water; and as *this is the only statute in the code*, which made it necessary for him to be baptized, there is no room to doubt that this is the statute to which he referred. If he did not refer to this statute, he referred to nothing, and his reply to John was without any meaning whatever. And, furthermore, if he was not baptized in obedience to this statute, here was one statute which was not obeyed by him, and consequently he did not "fulfil all righteousness." We are, therefore, brought to this alternative, viz., either to admit that Christ our Priest was baptized in obedience to this statute, or to deny that he fulfilled all righteousness!

INQUIRER. These considerations convince me that your views in regard to *the design* of Christ's baptism are correct.



So far you have *Scripture* on your side, and Immersers nothing but *fancy*. It is really matter of wonder with me, that intelligent Christians can be so positive, where their premises are so perfectly fanciful, and where *Scripture* is so decidedly against them. But admitting your views in regard to *the design* of Christ's baptism, was he not immersed? And did not the apostles adopt the mode in which he was baptized?

TEACHER. On what do you base the certainty that he was immersed?

INQUIRER. We read that "when he was baptized he went up straightway out of the water."

TEACHER. Observe, this was something which Christ did *after his baptism*, and was no part of that ordinance. The assumption of Immersers is founded upon a mistake of the import of the preposition "*out of*." The true sense of the Greek preposition is *from*, not "out of;" and it marks the place from which he went up, without at all suggesting the idea that Jesus had been *in* the water. The following translation gives the exact meaning of the original,—“he went up without delay from the water.” Now what is there here so conclusive in favor of immersion? As John was preaching close by the Jordan, he would go of course to the river to baptize. And whether he performed the ceremony by immersion, sprinkling, or pouring, there was *an equal necessity for descending the banks to the stream, and of ascending the banks from the stream*. Shall that, therefore, which our Saviour *must* have done, whether he was baptized by immersion or affusion, be taken as proof that he was immersed? The Methodist elder sometimes stands in the river, and pours the water upon the heads or faces of his converts. John might have taken his station in the river, for convenience, as the number to be baptized was very great, and have administered the rite in the same way.

INQUIRER. I see that this circumstance leaves the manner of our Saviour's baptism an *uncertainty*;—but still is it not more *probable* that he was immersed?

TEACHER. Probabilities will not answer the Immersers any good purpose. Surely that exclusive principle, which unchurches two thirds of the disciples of Christ, can never be justified, on the ground of a slender probability. In this instance, however, probabilities are against them. There is in fact the greatest degree of certainty that *our Saviour was baptized by affusion*. We have already proved that his baptism was introductory to his priest's office. The ceremonial law required that the washing of the priests, (Lev. viii. 6,) when consecrated to their office, should be performed by sprinkling. (Num. viii. 7.) *According to the Scriptures*, therefore, Jesus, our Priest, was sprinkled.

INQUIRER. If his baptism was designed as his consecration to his priestly office, it is certainly more *scriptural* to believe that he was sprinkled. It would hardly benefit Immersers to appeal to Christ's example in this particular.

TEACHER. His example, so far as it touches the mode of baptism, is wholly in our favor. And if the apostles copied the mode in which he was baptized, we need go no farther for proof that they practised affusion or sprinkling.

As we are now about to leave John's baptism, carefully review the ground already travelled over, and in view of the argument thus far developed, decide whether *such a degree of certainty* belongs to the side of the question espoused by Immersers, that they can be justified in disowning numerous churches of Christ, and refusing to eat the Lord's Supper with thousands of their brethren in Christ, merely because they have not received the waters of baptism in their particular way!!!

Remember that this controversy touches more than the

simple question of immersion. It is frequently said to the young convert, by those who practise immersion, "Join us, and you will be sure to be right; if the way in which the water is applied is not essential, you will be right; and if it is essential, you will be right." But stop—there is a deception lurking here. If you join with immersers, you countenance *their exclusive principle*; and are you *sure* that *that* will be right? Are you sure that it will be pleasing to the great Head of the Church, for you to give the sanction of your example to a principle so contracted, so contrary to the spirit of the age, so withering to some of the best feelings of the regenerated heart—a principle which the light and the fire of an approaching day shall consume?

INQUIRER. I cannot but believe, that it is our Lord's will, that his table should be the place, where all his true followers should merge their minor differences in mutual love. It would seem as if this sacred spot should be common ground. To give this table a sectarian character, or to make it an occasion of strife, is confessedly, a very serious matter. *These are evils to be avoided if possible*; and, therefore, we must have *the most satisfactory proof* that we are acting in obedience to the commands of Christ, before we can lawfully embrace any principle manifestly tending to such results. Such proof I have not yet seen in favor of immersion. The evidence thus far preponderates on the opposite side.

TEACHER. We have the advantage of Immersers in this argument. They embrace an exclusive principle, on the ground that immersion is the only baptism. The burden of proof, therefore, is with them. They must prove *conclusively* that it is the *only* baptism. If there remains any room for *doubting* the conclusiveness of their argument, *it wholly fails*; for who can believe for a moment that he is bound to separate from his Christian brethren, to make the

Lord's table sectarian, and to countenance schisms, *so long as there exists a reasonable doubt whether the Lord requires him to do it?*

INQUIRER. True—very true. But I would inquire whether the cases of Christian baptism in the New Testament are not clearly in favor of immersion?



Cheron.

Philip and the Eunuch.

## CHAPTER V.

### CHRISTIAN BAPTISM—BAPTISM ON THE DAY OF PENTECOST.

TEACHER. I see that you very properly make a distinction between John's baptism and Christian baptism. But not to detain the subject, what example of apostolic baptism shall we first examine?

INQUIRER. If you please, the baptisms of the day of Pentecost.

TEACHER. Please read the account, (Acts ii.) and point out to me *the proof* that the converts were immersed. It is not found in any tendency of the apostles that way, for *they had been educated to regard sprinkling as sufficient for ceremonial purification*, and from early childhood had seen the leper, and the Levites, and indeed the vessels of the temple cleansed by sprinkling. Why should men so educated have deemed sprinkling or pouring an improper symbol of purification by the Spirit, under the gospel, especially when they could not have failed to notice that *their scriptures uniformly described his influence as poured out upon men?*

INQUIRER. If the influence of their Jewish education was not counteracted by some command of Christ, they baptized unquestionably by pouring or sprinkling. And that any such command was given to them, by the great Head of the Church, we are not obliged to believe without proof.

TEACHER. Do you find the proof that is needed in the Pentecostal baptisms?

INQUIRER. I admit that I see nothing which decides in



favor of immersion. The inspired record merely states that the converts were baptized: but it gives no intimation that they left the place where they were assembled; nor that those preparations were made, which the immersion of a promiscuous multitude, *consisting of males and females*, always renders necessary.

TEACHER. This is a most decisive case, my friend. against immersion. On that memorable occasion, in the same day, (Acts ii. 41,) about 3000 persons were baptized and added to the church. Among the converts were Parthians and Medes, and Egyptians, &c. (vs. 9—11.) The assumption that they were immersed is not only a pure guess, *but it hangs by a string of most absurd guesses:*

Consider the facts. The 3000 must have been baptized in Jerusalem, or in some other place.

If we suppose that they *were baptized in Jerusalem*, (the only supposition which the record warrants,) mountainous difficulties lie in the way of the Immersers' guess. These events took place during the Pentecost, or about the latter part of the month of May, in Palestine a time of drought. In that country, from the middle of April to the middle of September, it neither rains nor thunders. In the beginning of harvest, a cloud is occasionally seen in the morning but it vanishes away; and hence the beautiful allusion of Hosea, where he compares the goodness of Ephraim to the *morning* cloud. (Hosea vi. 4.) Now the brook Cedron was dry, *except in the rainy part* of the year; and, therefore, at this time the footman might have walked across its channel with unwet sandal. The city afforded no other brooks or stream suited to the purposes of immersion. If there were baths, the Jews would sooner have opened them to swine, than to the followers of the hated Nazarene. Where then did the apostles find *a convenient place* in Jerusalem, to immerse in one day 3000 converts? This question presents a serious difficulty. But this is not the only difficulty. Suppose the

apostles succeeded in obtaining a suitable place, how could they have immersed 3000 *in so short a time?* When the wonders of that memorable day began to attract notice, it was already nine o'clock. If we make some *little* allowance for prayers, preaching, conversation with the candidates, confessions of faith, and for making *the preparations which immersion, even on a much smaller scale, always demands,* it must have been *at least* four o'clock, P. M., before they could have commenced baptizing. To be satisfied that this is not an extravagant calculation, we need only to ask ourselves, how many hours would be found necessary by Immersers in this city (where every convenience is near at hand,) for making decent preparations for the immersion of 3000 people, strangers foreigners, suddenly converted? It would require miraculous despatch, to get through with all the essential preliminaries in less than half a day! Now the apostles had 250 persons each. If we suppose them to have continued immersing, without any cessation, and at the rate of one a minute, the day must have ended before their task was done! But there is still another difficulty. As the converts *were strangers, embracing both sexes,* where did they get changes of apparel? Who provided them with immersing gowns? Did they borrow them on the spot? Or if obliged to search Jerusalem, running hither and thither, for these conveniences, how much of the day did this consume? Or were they plunged all over in water without any change of raiment? Or did they expose their naked persons to one another, and to gazing spectators, and thus violate the natural sense of shame?

In view of these difficulties, what monstrous guesses are necessary on the part of Immersers! They must, in the first place, *guess* that the apostles immersed the 3000; and in order to maintain this guess, they must guess that they found a convenient stream or brook in Jerusalem for immersing this immense multitude, when, from the known geography and



climate of the country, it is evident that no such stream could have been found—or they must guess that they had access to baths, (when the very swine would sooner have gained admittance,) and guess that there were baths enough to accommodate 3000. And when they have guessed out a suitable place for immersion, they must guess that the apostles immersed 250 persons each, in a few hours, giving them at the same time all needful instruction—and guess that they changed their apparel in the open air, men and women; or guess that they were accommodated with dressing chambers; or guess that they stripped themselves, and exposed their naked persons *while going down to the water and coming from it*;—or guess that they were plunged just as they were, and went about after the ceremony with their garments cleaving to their skin, and dripping upon the pavement of the city!

But suppose they were baptized *in some other place*. Observe, this is itself a guess. *The inspired narrative gives no hint of their leaving the city, or even the place where they were assembled*. Such an army of converts leaving the city, is a circumstance which the historian could not have failed to notice. But what is gained by this guess? The nearest river (the Jordan) was distant more than 20 miles. As it was not a day of omnibuses and railroads, how could that promiscuous host have reached the river in time for the ceremony? *In whatever place* we suppose the immersing to have been performed, we have the same *guessing* as to a change of apparel, &c. &c. And *the farther we remove it from the city*, and from the scene of the apostles' preaching, the greater the difficulty *in regard to time*.

INQUIRER. I must confess that I am not prepared to embrace a supposition which hangs by such a string of guesses; and much less to consider others, who find it impossible to guess quite so much where the Scriptures give no favorable data, as aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and as worthy of banishment from the Lord's table.

TEACHER. And yet, on this shadowy basis, Immersers claim the exclusive right to that table! One of their ministers in this city, concluded a series of discourses, which he has recently been preaching on immersion, in the following strain:—“I have a right to go to any evangelical church [meaning other than immersing churches] where the Lord’s table is spread, and partake of the symbols, and no man may lawfully forbid me;—nay more; I have a right to say to the communicants, you are intruders here;—nay, more than this, I have a right to say to that minister who officiates at the table, Stand aside,—thou hast no right to administer this ordinance!” Such a peroration excites only our pity.

## CHAPTER VI.

### BAPTISM OF THE ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH—OF THE PHILIPPIAN JAILER—OF SAUL—OF CORNELIUS.

INQUIRER. Previous to this examination, I have attached much importance to the case of the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch.

TEACHER. Please turn to that case, (Acts viii. 36,) and point out what you have considered as determining with certainty that he was immersed.

INQUIRER. I find that this case wears a new aspect ; for I really can find nothing in it, except that it is said that both Philip and the eunuch went into the water.

TEACHER. It may be well still to examine this point a little. Mark this, that the phrase “went down,” &c., does not denote the baptismal act. They went down, both Philip and the eunuch, but both were not baptized. So that the going down was only a preparatory act, and the coming up out of the water was something done after the baptism, and not the baptism itself. *This is what they would have done, whether they baptized by affusion or immersion.*

You must take into view *the circumstances and customs of the country*. It is well known that Orientals were accustomed to *step into* the water on all occasions, whether of washing, or taking up water in their hands to drink, or the like. Their dress about their feet was such as not to hinder the custom, and their warm climate made it pleasant. As they were moving on in a journey, they came to “SOME WATER” [for that is the literal rendering.] For baptism they must go to the water ; as that could be done more conveniently than water

could be brought to them. It was also natural and agreeable to the habits of the people. Now the question is, whether their doing what they naturally would do to baptize by pouring, proves that they baptized *another way*, and by immersion? If there were no occasion for stepping into the water, except the convenience of immersion, there would be some force in the Immersers' inference. But when there was an actual necessity for going into the water, in order to baptize *in any way*, their going into it can be no proof that they baptized by immersion.

We have an actual occurrence, which capitally illustrates this point. A Methodist minister and an Immerser, a few weeks since, in Charlestown, were baptizing at the same time and place, by the water's side. The Immerser took his candidate, and while going down, said, "And they went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch"—and after immersing him, he came out, saying by the way, "And they came up out of the water." Some of the spectators doubtless listened thus far, as to oracular proof of the necessity of immersion. Next the Methodist minister took his candidate, and *went down into the water*, repeating the same words—"And they went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch," and then took water and *poured* it upon his candidate, (according to the frequent practice of that sect,) and *came up repeating*—"And they came up out of the water, both Philip and the eunuch." So it was seen that the words of Scripture were as pertinent to one case as the other, and that one may do all that Philip is said to have done, without immersing.

As the Immersers' argument rests so much on the fancied import of the words "into" and "out of," it may be proper here to introduce the testimony of Prof. Ripley, of the Newton Theological Seminary. In his note on Matt. iii. 16, he says:—"Out of the water—The preposition here translated "out of," has the more general signification of the word *from*; and would be suitable, whether the sacred writer meant to

say that Jesus came *out from* the water, i. e. from within the river to the shore; or, that he came *from* the water, i. e. retired from the bank of the river to another place. This preposition, then, in itself furnishes no decision in respect to the manner of the ordinance." Here is an Immerser's concession, that the preposition fixes nothing. But the verb [*ἀνέβη*, "went up"] does of itself settle the question. If immersion had been the way, that verb should have had the force of *emerge*. But it is incapable of such a meaning; and we challenge any one, out of the numerous instances of its use, to find one where it has this meaning.

INQUIRER. It is one of the plainest cases, that *it is impossible to make it certain that the eunuch was immersed*.

TEACHER. That is enough for our purpose. If the Bible has left the mode of applying water in *uncertainty*, no man has a right to require me to act as though it were *certain* that immersion is the mode. No one is justified in shutting me from the Lord's table, because my *guesses* as to the mode will not run in the same line with his. But *the probabilities are, in fact, against immersion in this case*. They took the first water which they found. It was no river; for if it was, the narrative would have said so. But it only says, they came to "*some water*," [*τι ὕδωρ*,] just as it would have said if it were the smallest quantity, and just as it would *not* have said if it were a river. Both geography and history show that it was not a river. Hierome, who lived several years at Jerusalem, and was well acquainted with the country, reports that about twenty miles from Jerusalem, in the road towards Hebron, there is a village called Bethsoron, near to which is a mountain, at the bottom or foot whereof is a spring, where the Acts of the Apostles relate that the Ethiopian was baptized by Philip. Eusebius reported the same. Bedā, some hundred years afterwards, reported the said village then remaining, consenting with Eusebius and Hierome as to the baptism of the eunuch in the spring. A modern traveller, Sandys, men-



tions this passage by Bethsoron, where he says—"We saw the fountain whose pleasant waters are forthwith drunk up by the earth that produced them. There they say Philip baptized the eunuch; whereupon it retains the name of the Ethiopian fountain."

Now on which side are the probabilities? Geography, history, tradition and the inspired narrative are silent as to any river existing where they were. But that there was this spring, or fountain, standing alone in a dry and desert land, we have this positive evidence. In view of all the facts of the case, see how much the Immerser has to rely on guesses for the substance of his argument from this case, so much quoted by him. He guesses that Philip immersed the eunuch; and to support this guess, he must guess again that there was a river where we know there was none. Then he must guess that the eunuch exposed his nakedness to Philip, and Philip exposed his nakedness to the eunuch—or he must guess that Philip, travelling on foot, had come provided with a change of garments, contrary to Christ's advice to his first missionaries, not to take two coats apiece—or he must guess that Philip went in for immersing with his only dress on.

INQUIRER. It seems clear, that either of these assumptions is a guess against probability. Besides, Philip was caught away "*immediately*" after the baptism; and it is not likely that he was caught away either naked or dripping wet, and set down in the streets of the city of Azotus; whence, we read, he went forth preaching the gospel. It is manifestly unjust to exclude one from the Lord's table because he cannot join in such a guess. But as this is an important case, can we not gather light from some other Scripture, which may indicate that Philip did or did not practise immersion?

TEACHER. Yes. The very passage which the eunuch was reading, Isa. lii. 15, says—"He shall *sprinkle* many nations."\*

\* The Hebrew word, *yazza*, translated shall sprinkle, occurs in several other passages, in which it can mean nothing else than sprinkle.

The eunuch was one of these many nations. This probably suggested a conversation on baptism, and led to his request to

For instance, Exodus xxix. 21: "And thou shalt take of the blood that is upon the altar and of the anointing oil and *sprinkle* it upon Aaron," &c. Lev. iv. 6: "And the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and *sprinkle* of the blood seven times." Lev. v. 9: "And he shall *sprinkle* of the blood of the sin-offering upon the side of the altar." Lev. xiv. 7: "And he shall *sprinkle* upon him that is cleansed from the leprosy seven times." Indeed, aside from the Septuagint itself, we can get from no source any shadow of a warrant for translating it as the Septuagint has done. Michaelis gives the word in this passage the sense of sprinkle, and thus renders the phrase in Latin—"Sic adasperget gentes multas et validas."

The Rev. Dr. Jenks has favored us with the following note from Vitranga:

"Isa. lii. 15: 'So shall he sprinkle many nations.' This is a counterpart to the former clause, and exhibits the glorious state of the Messiah, as opposed to his humiliation. The Jews themselves confess and teach that the prophet here declares: 'As his degradation, or wretchedness and suffering, was in an extreme degree; in an equally extreme degree will be his exaltation;' forming thus a comparison between the two conditions.

"The Hebrew word here used has uniformly the meaning, in Scripture, of sprinkling. The idea is purely evangelical, to be alone explained by the mystery of the gospel, and economy of the kingdom of JESUS CHRIST, in this place of most easy and appropriate interpretation: which, that it should not be understood by the Jews,<sup>a</sup> who study with a

<sup>a</sup> In a note, *Vitranga* reviews the opinions of *Grotius*, *L'Empereur*, *Abarbanel* and *Alex. More*, chiefly following the Septuagint, and giving the idea of 'affecting the nations with wonder,' or of 'scattering them,' and adds: 'As to the first opinion, is it probable? Why is darkness coveted, in the midst of light? As to the second, I say, that the version is absurd, whether you look at the idea, or the fact. The idea is uniformly given of a liquid (water or blood) with which a thing or person is sprinkled. Has this anything in common with the dispersion of enemies conquered in battle? As to the fact: did JESUS CHRIST disperse the nations he came to save? Did he not rather collect them?' *Abarbanel* is then quoted as referring to Isa. lxiii. 3, to sustain his opinion, and *Kimchi*, the father and son, explaining the passage in the sense of distilling, ascribed to language, thus of indoctrinating. [As *Moses*, 'my speech shall distil as the dew.'] Then he subjoins, 'Reader, lament with me, that the pure and chaste word of God should be exposed so much to the sport of human imagination, obscuring its glory and power: not indeed always because of igno-



be baptized. Having learned that Christ was to sprinkle many nations, he would not have been willing to be immersed,

diversified but fruitless effort to twist its meaning into something else, I do not wonder; but that Christian interpreters, and those who love the gospel, when they distinctly see that nothing can now be spoken more truly of CHRIST, nor more in agreement with his discipline, should yet assign other senses to the passage, I greatly wonder. Is it that we deny Isaiah to have been so perfectly illuminated by the Spirit, as to have fully unveiled the whole mystery of the gospel? God forbid! The next sentence will teach us, that *he saw* all that the history declares befel CHRIST JESUS, however paradoxical the events were. The sense of this passage is clear, plain, certain; that CHRIST JESUS will apply the virtue of the blood shed by him, as the Great High Priest of the house of God, to the purification of the consciences of many and great nations, and to their illumination and sanctification; and that he will afford them the justification obtained for them by his obedience unto blood, as he interprets his meaning afterwards, in ch. lviii. 11; but that these nations who believe in him shall receive the sign of this benefit, and profess their faith in *baptism*, to be instituted by the command of JESUS CHRIST, and to be administered by his apostles and servants—this baptism sealing to those who profess CHRIST, the same which was formerly signified by the various purifications, under the ancient economy, made by *washing* or *sprinkling*, for these modes are equivalent each to the other. So in Ezekiel, ch. xxxvi. 26: ‘And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean.’ But Peter, in his first epistle, ch. i. 2, and the apostle to the Hebrews, x. 22, xii. 24, use the very word sprinkle, and the phrase, sprinkling of the blood of CHRIST, which is the idea in Isaiah. For the word here rendered sprinkle, and which is used in Levit. iv. 6, and in Num. viii. 7, refers chiefly to the act of a high priest, who sprinkles upon the people the blood of a victim offered for them, in order to purify them: since to sprinkle anything with blood is to apply its virtue for purification. Compare Eph. v. 26, with Tit. ii. 14. Thus the glorifying of JESUS CHRIST among the Gentiles, given to him for an inheritance, was to begin. The justifi-

rance, for this might plead an excuse, after diligent efforts had been made; but because of prejudices arising from incredulity, or the wavering and unstable judgment of the multitude. It is *water*, here, which creates a difficulty with Jewish expositors, as they cannot make the *sprinkling* of it agree with any of their hypotheses. But why do Christians avoid the light that here shines!’

but would choose to follow the way of Christ, as foretold by Isaiah. We are well aware that Immersers, in their natural anxiety to evade the point of this argument, find fault with our translators for following the original Hebrew in this place, and not preferring the translation of the Seventy. But that evasion is insufficient.

INQUIRER. Your argument, if I understand it, does not depend on that allusion, while, if that allusion be indeed a prophecy of baptism, it brings decisive confirmation to it.

TEACHER. We will turn now to the baptism of the Philippian jailer, Acts xvi. 33. Where did it take place? Not in his own house—for we are told, that after the transaction he brought Paul and Silas into his house. If we follow the record, we find that it took place in the prison—where to suppose there was a bath, or other convenience for immersion, were against all probability. The narrative favors the supposition that the washing of the stripes and the baptism were done at the same place, and by water procured by similar means. And we shall not be condemned at the day of judgment, if we are shut out from the Lord's table for not being able to *guess* that there was a bath in that prison, or to guess that they resorted to it, when the record hints nothing of the kind. If we suppose that the jailer was baptized with a portion of the same water brought to wash the stripes, we have only one supposition, and that natural, simple, and favored by the narrative. But they who contend that he was immersed, must first *guess* that he was; and then prop up that guess by guessing again that there was a bath in prison, a luxury not usually granted to prisoners, especially by unmerciful pagans. And then they must guess that they left the inner prison and cation obtained by the Messiah was to be furnished and applied to them, for illumination, purification, righteousness, and life.

VITRINGA, in loco.

“It were well, perhaps, to ask, if the word ‘sprinkle,’ in this passage, had been ‘immerse,’ whether its authority would not have been final, in settling the mode.”

W. J.”

resorted to it—or they must guess that the jailer and his whole family, and Paul and Silas reeking with their wounds, went out at midnight to some river, expressly against the orders of the magistrate to the jailer to keep them safely. Now those who prefer to hang on such a string of guesses, may do it; but let them banish none from the Lord's table for not taking their guesses for holy writ.

INQUIRER. I suppose you would dispose of the case of the baptism of Saul much in the same way.

TEACHER. Not a circumstance in that case favors immersion, *but everything looks the other way, and shows that he received such a baptism as he might receive in the room where he was.* He was sick and weak. And all that is told us is, that while confined to his room, blind, faint, and fasting, Ananias on entering the house said to him—"Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales, and he received sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized." Now we have here one entire scene. The coming in of Ananias—the salutation—the removing of the blindness—his rising from his couch of sickness, and his baptism, are all one scene, occurring in the same time and place. These small particulars are given, and it is incredible that a circumstance so important as going out or carrying out a sick man for immersion is omitted. Indeed, where the Bible intimates no such thing, we have no right to say that they went out.

But to maintain his position, the Immerser must guess that there was a river or a bath near at hand—guess that a sick man rose from his couch, after eating or drinking nothing for three days, and was yet able to bear the fatigue of walking the distance to and fro, and the exposure of the immersion. And do such guesses come near enough to certainty to justify the pernicious consequences of the close communion principle!

The next case is that of Cornelius, Acts x. Here is *an entire absence of any intimation of immersion*. Peter says—“Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?” He does not ask—Can any man forbid us going to the river? but, can any one forbid water, to be brought and applied to their baptism on the spot? In his rehearsal of the affair to his brethren afterwards, he told them that as he began to preach, the Holy Ghost *fell on* [mark the expression] the Gentiles as on the Jews at the beginning. This called to mind, he says, the word of the Lord, how that he said—John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Here you see that the *pouring out* and the *falling on* of the Holy Ghost is called baptism, and reminded Peter of baptism. And Peter, being thus reminded of the *Lord's* baptism, would not go right away and baptize in a different way. And then he baptized “*with water*” [*υδρις*, the dative of the instrument without a preposition] and not *in* the water. From an examination of the case, all the probabilities are against immersion. That there was immersion here, is a guess without a shadow of a foundation.

We have now examined all the passages which have any material bearing on the question. And we will here make two general remarks. (1.) The apostles were wont to baptize on the spot where the occasion for baptizing occurred. If they were in prison, they baptized in prison; if on a journey, they used the water by the way-side; if in a sick-room, they baptized there. And we never read of their going out to find a convenient place for immersing—a very singular fact if they always immersed. And neither do we ever read of a change of garments in baptizing. (2.) Those baptized were said to have been baptized not *in* but *with* water. The water is made the instrument with which, and not the element in which, they were baptized.

We will next state a few objections to immersion:

1. It does not so well agree with the main design and import of baptism—i. e. purifying by an influence poured out.

2. It does not harmonize with the simplicity of the Gospel.

3. It cannot be administered in all times and places where baptism is desirable.

4. It is often cumbrous and inconvenient.

5. It favors the Popish conceit of the efficacy of penance, in that it lays stress on overcoming the natural repugnance to such a mode, in the idea that in it consists the taking up of the cross.

6. It is indelicate. We are aware that the mention of this objection is taken with offence. Yet it is one which *ought to be urged*, and will have influence with serious and unbiassed minds. It violates a natural and healthful sense of propriety, for females to expose themselves in water, with and before the other sex. Though modesty forbids the statement of this objection in all its force, it is enough to say, that the sacrifice of female modesty, in a religious rite, is an offering not required at our hands.

These reasons, *since immersion is not commanded*, would of themselves lead us to seek some other mode.

## CHAPTER VII.

### CONCLUDING REMARKS.

THE suggestion which is frequently made, that one had better be immersed at any rate, "*for then he will be sure to be right,*" deserves some notice.

If by being right is meant the following of the scriptural mode, *one by being immersed will be sure to be wrong.* But the main objection to that suggestion is that it assumes that the question is only about the quantity of water needful to be applied; whereas the doctrine of the Immersers involves a principle, which sunders the union of the church, and divides the house of God against itself. It is not with you simply the question whether more or less water shall be used in your baptism. But if you are immersed, you must *adopt Immersers' principles*, to wit, that immersion only is baptism, and deny the baptism of all not immersed, and exclude them from the Lord's table. You must pronounce the act of your baptism in infancy a solemn farce, and trample on that covenant, which perhaps has been the cord of love, to bring you to Christ. Or, if you have not been baptized, and in that case prefer immersion, the inference is that you do it from principle, since that is not the mode which convenience suggests. And the principle on which you prefer it, is understood to be that another mode is not baptism. So that when you consent to be immersed, it is understood, unless some circumstances indicate the contrary, that you put your hand and seal to the avowal, that all churches, but those of Immersers, are walking disorderly, making an unauthorized use of Christian ordi-



nances, and are virtually intruding, with unhallowed feet, where Korah, Dathan, and Abiram went.

And you would not only unchurch a majority of the people of God, but *you would unchurch yourself and your immersing brethren*. For if immersion only is baptism, then the Immersers of this country have taken their baptism from the unbaptized! The first person immersed here was Roger Williams. He was originally a Pedobaptist, and was immersed by a layman, Ezekiel Holyman, and then he immersed Mr. Holyman, and the rest of his church. Most of the immersions which have since taken place in this country, trace their pedigree to these cases. But Mr. Williams soon made the discovery that he had unchurched himself, and frankly confessed to his church that he had misled them—and was not competent to administer baptism. And now what did he do? Did he go to one who had been baptized by immersion in a true line of apostolical succession? Alas, he knew of none such in the world! Learned man as he was, he could not find such a lineage of Immersers, though less learned men in later times pretend to find them! He was driven, by his views of consistency to his immersing principles, to declare that Christian ordinances had been lost, and there was no church in the world, and could not be, till other apostles should come, with miraculous powers. For the rest of his life, therefore, he separated from all churches. Disguise it as you may, this is the necessary result of the close communion immersing principle. So that, so far from being sure of being right, in adopting this principle, you are sure to be wrong; and avow a principle which makes all Christians wrong, and all churches no churches.

Close communion and immersion, as usually held, *are one and the same principle*. And the consent to be immersed, takes a fearful sweep. It by necessary consequence makes one an assailant of the peace and unity of the church. It compels him to deny the validity of the baptism of most pro-

fessing Christians, and to bring his own into serious question. It involves the necessity of holding that all Pedobaptist churches are no churches, and their ministers no ministers; and yet under such circumstances as compel most Immersers to waver in that denial. It compels one to take the ground that most of the Lord's children have no right to the Lord's table—that most of those who have spiritual communion with Christ, may not have sacramental communion with him—that most of those who feed on Christ, may not feed on the appointed emblems of him—that most of those destined to sit at the marriage-supper of the Lamb, must be driven from the sacramental supper.

If you become an Immerser, you also take up a principle *that wars against Christian love*. The Immerser claims credit for consistency to his principles, in proportion as he drives the war of extermination against all other sects, which in his esteem are no churches of Christ. Though few Immersers fully act out their principles in this particular, this principle has given their sect a character, which is generally allowed to be, above all others, given to proselytism. The most odious forms and measures of proselyting have their justification in the close communion principle, which makes all other churches no churches. If one pronounces all Pedobaptists aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise—unbaptized, unfit to come to the Lord's table—if one feels prompted to use measures of proselyting, from which most others would shrink, to build his sect on the ruins of others—if he more than insinuates, where he may do it successfully, that one must be immersed or be damned, and thus carries his point by overmastering the fears of the weak and confiding—if one feels bound to do what Balaam dared not do, and pronounce accursed whom God has not cursed, he retreats behind his principle of immersion. Consistency to that requires it all. But that must be a pernicious principle, that engenders such pernicious

consequences. Is one so sure of being right if he adopts it?

Then *what practical advantage does this principle offer, to compensate for all its evil.* Does it give us better hopes of heaven? Does it lead to the formation of better Christian character? Does it foster a higher spirit of obedience? These are questions touching matters of fact, which each one can answer for himself. Were we to test the matter by reference to the cause of Foreign Missions, we might, in one particular, get tangible results. The Immersers claim to be the largest denomination in the United States; of course it must be larger than that of the Congregationalists, together with that portion of the Presbyterians which sustain the American Board of Missions. Yet how do the two boards compare? The Immersers' board raises and expends but about one fifth as much annually, as does that of the "unbaptized" Congregationalists and Presbyterians. If the spirit of benevolence is any test of principle, we see in this particular no advantage from immersion.

Or does immersion show its superior advantages, *in its influence on civil society?* We take you to Rhode Island, a community whose infancy was cradled by the immersing principle. Its institutions and the early formation of its character were about as much affected by that principle, as the institutions and character of Massachusetts and Connecticut were affected by the contrary principle. And, to say the least, no powerful persuasive to immersion comes from Rhode Island.

But it is said, that Immersers have been prosperous and successful; and this is drawn into an argument in defence of their principle. What desirable prosperity they have had, however, may be more owing to the cardinal principles of the gospel in their hands than to their use of this party-shibboleth. Yet success in building up a sect is a doubtful test of the distinctive principles of that sect. For Papists and Mormons

might use such an argument to good effect. All other things being equal, success in *building* a sect, should be in some proportion to exertions *made*; and if the exertions of Immersers to enlist recruits from other sects, outstrip those of all others, should not their success be in some proportion to their efforts?

They have also had special advantage for gathering the lambs from Pedobaptist flocks. A public sentiment has greatly prevailed among Congregationalists against publicly discussing the Immersers' errors; and indeed against all efforts, even for self-defence, against proselytism. A large class among us are ready to frown upon all efforts of the kind. Their disgust at the proselytism of the Immersers, has made them over-scrupulous, lest we should imbibe their spirit, in attempting a defence against them. This has in a great measure paralyzed efforts on our part, and given Immersers an advantage which they have not been slow to use. But Immersers have no clogs of this sort. Who ever heard of an Immerser reproved by Immersers for defending the principles of his sect—or even for furious onsets on other sects?

This difference leads to another. By this state of things it has come about that most Immersing ministers, however deficient in other particulars, have concentrated their main strength on the subject of baptism; and so have their argument at their tongue's end, and (what is more important) are familiar with all the little tactics of proselytism. But Pedobaptist ministers, taught to feel that they have less use for thorough knowledge on this subject, are in a way to cultivate that knowledge less. It is felt to be more important to preach so as to convert sinners, than to preach so as to prevent their running into Anabaptism. And because they have thus felt and acted, Immersers have seized on the fact, as an occasion to represent that Pedobaptists, generally, do not understand the subject; and have not examined it—and do so

and so merely because their fathers did : and whatever show of truth they are able to throw around this representation, is very useful to their sinister purpose. Hence, too, it is often, and with great confidence asserted, among Immersers, that Pedobaptist ministers are not sincere in their belief. There is, indeed, good reason for believing that the more general idea of Immersers, as to us, is, that we practise Pedobaptism, and refuse immersion, against the convictions of our judgment and conscience. This persuasion, so potent for popular effect, has originated partly, perhaps, from the proselyting industry of the others, and partly from our comparative indifference as to defending our principles. Our fear to err on the side of proselytism, has been construed into a disbelief of our principles, and an impression, highly mischievous, has been produced. Our ministers have been made to feel that it is next to a sin to resist aggressive efforts, and show any zeal in attachment to our distinctive principles. Some of our writers on the subject, from a desire to show a generous and liberal spirit, have made unwarrantable concessions. Preaching on the subject has been too much discouraged. In revivals of religion, ministers have given place to the grossest proselyting efforts, fearing to check the revival by restraining them. With all these advantages and exertions, the wonder is, that Immersers have not made more progress than they have.

If our principles are worth defending, public sentiment among us should be so far correct as to allow of the labor of defence, and not to go into spasms at the occurrence of "CONTROVERSY" on the subject. Our ministers, also, must make themselves familiar with the points of the argument, and the best modes of presenting them. It is not sufficient that they study the subject enough to satisfy their own minds. It is their duty to preserve their people from being seduced into a pernicious error ; and for this purpose they need to understand not only the truth, but also all the tactics by



which the truth is assailed. Disagreeable as the duty may be, he is an unfaithful servant who, in this day, shrinks from it. Private Christians, too, have duties in relation to this subject, the nature of which may be learned from the shape of the efforts put forth by many of the members of immersing churches; and, uncongenial as they are, these duties must be done, unless we are willing to suffer "the way of truth to be evil spoken of."



THE BAPTISMAL QUESTION.

---

A

REVIEW

OF THE

REV. MESSRS. COOKE AND TOWNE'S

HINTS TO AN INQUIRER

ON THE

SUBJECT OF BAPTISM.

---

BY WILLIAM HAGUE.

Pastor of the Federal Street Baptist Church.

---

BOSTON:  
GOULD, KENDALL & LINCOLN.  
59 Washington Street.

---

1842.

3243-  
11/21/1977



## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

THE pamphlet to which I have here furnished a Reply, was issued yesterday. On Saturday last, I first saw public notice given of the republication in this form of some numbers from the columns of the 'Puritan.' Of those numbers I had heard, but had not read them. A friend sent them to me; I read them on that day, and have this week prepared an answer. I mention this to show the reason of my noticing only one of the two authors, whose names are on the pamphlet before me. It having been publicly announced that the Rev. Mr. Towne was the sole author, I wrote under that impression. I have chosen to refer to him alone moreover, because I should not have noticed the book at all, had I not learned that it was from the pen of one of our city pastors; and as the matter now stands before the public, he is as responsible for one part of the production as the other.

BULFINCH STREET. }  
*Thursday, May 26, 1842.* }



## REVIEW.

---

THERE is one feature of this pamphlet which will certainly be pleasing to every reader; that is, the tone of sincerity which animates it. The author writes like one who not only feels an interest in his subject, but also a conviction of the truth of his own statements. He takes a clear and decided position, and risks his whole cause upon a single issue. This we like. It is coming to the point. It exhibits the manliness inspired by sincere belief. It is true, here and there, we are forced to pause, and ask, "Is it possible for an intelligent Christian and scholar to believe this?" Yet the language and spirit of the whole production set the question aside, and lead us to the conclusion that he has written from his heart as well as his intellect; that he "believes, and therefore speaks."

It is not for the sake of paying a compliment, that we make this remark, but because we are really pleased when commencing a discussion, to feel that we have to do with a sincere man. It is not always so. In reading controversial writings, one's feelings are often ruffled by the impression constantly recurring, that this or that is said merely for effect, and rather from the spirit of "partiality and hypocrisy," than a deep conviction of its justness. We are aware that a man may be sincere in defending error as well as truth; and that when through inadvertence, or prejudice of education, or want of sufficient knowledge, he has adopted one wrong principle, it may lead him into a thousand absurdities, yet it smooths the path of controversy, to believe that you have an honest opponent. Frail as Mr. Towne's argument really is, untenable as his position appears to be when sound philology pours its light around it, he undoubtedly thinks it

strong; and if he venture forth into this field of discussion with a bolder step and an air of greater confidence than many of his predecessors, it is because he sees less clearly than they, the difficulties which are before him, and the perils which beset his path. A man's confidence that he is right, sometimes arises from the limitation of his views.

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that this exhibition of a sincerity of belief, is blended with a strong glow of denominational antipathy. This appears at the outset, in refusing to apply to the Baptists the name by which they are usually designated. The reason assigned for this is, that it would imply a concession that they alone properly baptize. Hence, he insists on calling them "Immersionists." Now this denotes a morbid state of mind, which would be very likely to bias his judgment, and unfit him for an impartial investigation. He, who cannot give to a denomination of Christians the name by which they have been long known in a community and among different nations, is ill prepared to do justice to their cause. If such a mode of attack were followed out, the mouths of different sects would be filled with contemptuous epithets. With equal reason, the Baptists might say, we will not call the Congregationalists by the name which they have assumed, for we also are Congregationalists; and to do so, would imply a concession that they have an exclusive right to the name. With the same reason we might say it of the Independents in England; as if yielding the name, implied that all other churches were in a state of subjection to a hierarchy. Just so too we might refuse to speak of the Episcopalians by their usual designation, on the ground that it involved a concession that they alone have bishops; and believing that in the scriptural sense, we have bishops as well as they, we might insist on calling them Diocesans. But what would be the consequence of all this? Nothing but strife, bitterness and mutual disrespect. Let us have nothing to do with such childish bickering. The apostle Peter places the practice of courtesy in the list of Christian duties; and if we have aught of its spirit, we will yield to each denomination the name by which it is usually known, and beware how we "strive about words to no profit."



With Mr. Towne's "preliminary thoughts," we think the Baptists will cordially agree. He says, "a divine simplicity characterizes the New Testament institutions, and it is contrary to the genius of the gospel, to lay great stress on outward rites. It rather invites the main solitudes upon ordering the heart and life." In such a sentiment, it might be expected that the Baptists would heartily accord, since they have long been distinguished for maintaining the SPIRITUALITY of the Christian religion, and showing that none have a right to baptism at all, until they have repented of sin, and yielded their hearts to God. For this they have been persecuted for ages past in Europe. In the reign of Henry VIII., as Bishop Burnet tells us, a national creed was issued, approved by "the whole clergy of the realm," declaring that "infants must needs be christened, because they be born in original sin, which cannot be remitted without baptism, whereby they receive the Holy Ghost." The Baptists of that day could not assent to this, but defended the doctrine of infant salvation in all its breadth, and were exposed to the censure of all the Pædobaptists of England, for declaring that there is no difference "between the infant of a Christian and a Turk," but that both might be saved without baptism.

Equally ready am I to assent to another preliminary remark, that the gospel does not "lay stress on the *mode* of performing an external rite." I have never contended for any particular *mode* of baptism, but for the rite itself; for that which is essential to its very nature; for that which the word used in the commission of our Lord positively enjoins. If sprinkling were a mode of baptism, I should never think of practicing immersion. It would be a gross absurdity to do it, and a sin to urge it on the conscience of a Christian convert, if sprinkling a few drops of water on the forehead, would really meet the demand of the word in the baptismal statute. If the word *baptizo* in the Greek Testament does not denote the act of immersion, or dipping, in *distinction from other modes of applying* a liquid, the foundation of the Baptist argument is not laid in solid rock, but on a shifting quicksand. I am glad therefore that Mr. Towne has defined his position so clearly as he has done, in declaring that the word *baptizo* does not de-

note any particular use of water, but all possible ways in which it can be applied; that in the New Testament it evidently means to sprinkle; and, (to quote his phrase with all the emphasis with which he has printed it,) "THERE IS NOT THE SLIGHTEST GROUND TO SUPPOSE THAT ANY INSPIRED MINISTER EVER BAPTISED BY IMMERSION." Let him make this clear on the same principles on which we ascertain the meaning of other words in the English or any other language in the world, and I pledge myself at once to abjure immersion for ever, and to receive sprinkling at his hand.

#### MEANING OF THE WORD.

It is evident at a glance, that the turning point in this controversy is the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo*, which stands in our Bibles with an English termination. The circumstances connected with the administration of the rite, the places chosen, such as Jordan and Enon, the force of the Greek prepositions *eis* and *ek*, which express a descent *into* and a rising up *out of* the water as definitely as any prepositions in the Greek language can do it; are all strongly *corroborative* of our position that the act of baptism denoted by the term in Christ's commission, is properly and adequately translated into English by the word *immersion* which comes from the Latin, or by the word *dipping* of Anglo-Saxon origin. Nevertheless, if it can be clearly proved beforehand, that the active verb *baptizo*, the name of an action, is, when used with reference to water, so indeterminate as not to denote any particular kind of action, but rather all possible modes of use of which water is susceptible, from that of a single drop to an ocean, then it follows,—that however much of doubt the circumstances and prepositions might occasion to tender consciences, the baptismal law from the lips of Christ, contained in the commission, presents a great variety of modes to the choice of the individual, or leaves it, as the Pope of Rome would say, to be determined by *church authority*. The common sense of mankind, has always determined that the language of law should be definite;

but this supposition attributes to the great Legislator of the church, language the most vague and indeterminate. The main question is, whether the word used by Christ, to enjoin baptism, in the last exercise of his legislation on earth, in giving that commission which is binding "to the end of the world," denotes a *specific* act or not. If it does not, then there is no *law* which certainly holds us to immersion, or defines what act the Saviour meant, whether it were the application of water to the head or the feet, the face or the hands. If it does, then all objections drawn from supposed difficulties, or improbabilities, or from the greater convenience of sprinkling, are no more to be regarded as arguments, than those questions which skeptics sometimes ask in order to throw discredit on the very letter and spirit of revelation.

Now this great question, "What sort of action does the word *baptizo* denote?" Mr. Towne approaches in a very curious way. It is worth while to mark it well, to see how sophistry may lead captive a confiding reader. He says, "All agree that baptism is water applied by a proper person to a proper person in the name of the Trinity. This much is fixed and settled." This broad, vague definition of baptism is very unscholarlike in a discussion where the meaning of the chief term is to be settled. Baptism is the name of some kind of action or other, and has nothing to do in itself considered with the character of the administrator or the subject, the invocation of the Trinity, or any particular element, whether it be oil or wine, or blood or water. After the meaning of the term is settled, then if the question should arise, what is involved in the performance of the *Christian institute* of baptism, the above quotation would be a just reply. What would be thought of the philology of a Jew, if he were asked, what is the meaning of the word sprinkle, and he should reply, it denotes the striking of the blood of a lamb, upon the door posts of a house by a proper person at a proper time, to commemorate a great deliverance? This would be a queer definition of a word which is the name of an action, but would do very well as an answer to another question, namely, "what is involved in God's *ordinance* of passover sprinkling?" Yet Mr. T. goes on

to say, "You will settle it therefore whether immersion alone, is baptism at all. If I fall from a ship's side and am thoroughly immersed—is that baptism? No. Or if men immerse me by force—is that baptism? No. Or if I am immersed by my own consent, but not in the name of the Trinity—is that baptism? No. Well then, neither immersion, nor the use of water in any way is baptism; WHICH IS SOMETHING MORE." p. 6. Now what absurdity is here! Why, if baptism be immersing, and especially if it be any application of water, then all this is baptism, though not *Christ's ordinance* of baptism. In the very same chapter he speaks of the pharisaic washings of hands, cups and couches, as real baptism, in the New Testament use of the term. And so they were, as we shall show, though not Christ's ordinance. Whence arises this confusion? whence this effort to confound the name of an action, with all the circumstances of an ordinance? Evidently from a disposition to lead the inquirer's mind away from the point at issue, and to get scope enough to put into the *word, baptizo*, all that vast variety of meaning which will subject the Saviour's rite to the caprice of every applicant, and give the dignity of its name to every way of applying water which the human imagination may suggest.

This is evident from the terms in which Mr. T. announces the ultimate conclusion at which he thinks he has arrived. "If the word therefore denotes the application of water in divers ways, it is indeterminate, like our word *wash*, and does not define any one way in which the water shall be applied in the religious rite. This conclusion is immovable. We have sustained it by a multitude of examples cited before; *and that all lexicographers concur in it, no intelligent Immerser will deny.*"

NOW THIS IS THE VERY THING WHICH I DO DENY. Here is a question of fact: Do all the lexicographers agree in saying that the word is indeterminate? I aver that the standard lexicographers of every country where Greek literature is studied, agree in saying just the contrary in their lexicons. If Mr. Towne has had private communications from any of them, reversing what they have printed, let him produce the documents or testimony.

But if the question is to be settled by an appeal to the books, the proofs are now before my eyes. My assertion is, that the words *bapto* and *baptizo*, (which are, as Mr. T. observes, both from one root and so nearly identical in meaning as to allow our speaking of them as one word,) are determinate as to mode, and in this the lexicographers generally agree.

The first authority which I will produce is one which might be expected above all others to support Mr. Towne's position — the Lexicon of the New Testament, by Doctor Robinson, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover. I quote him first, because his work contains English definitions, and is accessible to those who wish to consult it. Turn to the word *bapto*. The first meaning which occurs, is "to dip in, to immerse." The first example to illustrate this meaning, is John xiii. 26, where Jesus is represented as using the word to designate the act of dipping the sop into the dish before giving it to Judas. The next example is Leviticus iv. 6, where the Septuagint has this term. It is worthy of particular notice by the reader of the Bible, because the three words, *dip*, *sprinkle* and *pour* are brought into close connection. "And the priest shall DIP his finger in the blood, and SPRINKLE of the blood seven times before the Lord; and (verse 7,) shall POUR all the blood of the bullock at the bottom of the altar." Here are three different actions expressed by their three appropriate names, and yet Mr. Towne would have us believe that the first word (*bapto*) means the same thing as the other two! Could any thing be more absurd? This quotation of itself shows that the first word is determinate as to mode.

The second and last meaning in Robinson's Lexicon under *bapto*, is thus marked: "(b) by impl. *to tinge, to dye.*" That abbreviated word, denoting "*by implication,*" is very important in this case, and involves the principle which Mr. T. from first to last has overlooked, and by overlooking it, he misunderstands the lexicons, and his philology is entirely confounded. The word *bapto* indeed means to dye, but then it is by IMPLICATION. And why by implication? Because if any thing be



dipped or baptized in coloring matter, staining, tinging, or dyeing is the *effect*. The first example to illustrate this meaning is Revelations xix. 13; a vesture dipped in blood. The word which the lexicographer has brought to prove that *bapto* means to dye is in the New Testament translated *dipped*. When therefore *bapto* means staining or dyeing, it only implies it, and denotes that it is performed by dipping instead of any other way. This indeed is the usual way of dyeing, as any one knows who has visited a dye-house. It is obvious too that a thing may be colored by being sprinkled, but *bapto* does not designate that act, and could never be used in connection with it in a literal sense, unless it were to express the idea that the substance had become thoroughly drenched, or as wet as if it had been dipped.

The principle here developed in relation to *bapto*, applies of course to *baptizo*. There is not a lexicon in the world, which does not give as the primary, the leading meaning, under *baptizo*, "to immerse, to sink, to submerge, dip or plunge, either two or all of them. And if to dye, stain, wash, or cleanse, is added, it is as we have just seen, by *implication*. Having now examined again, the celebrated lexicon of Scapula, I will here present all the meanings under *baptizo*: merge — immerse, (used in regard to those things which, for the sake of dyeing or washing, we immerse in water.) Likewise, merge — submerge, overwhelm with water. Also, *wash off* — *lave*. He then adds, that it is applied by Christians to the rite of initiation into the church. Now here are *all* the meanings given to the word, by one of the most celebrated lexicons in Europe. First, the primary, specific meaning, and then, in a parenthesis, the exclusion of any meaning more general, limiting its application to those cases of dyeing and washing, where for the sake of washing or dyeing, the thing is immersed. A like parenthesis occurs under *bapto*. Mergo, immergo — Item tingo, (quod fit immergendo;) that is, in English, merge, immerse, likewise dye, (which is done by immersing.) The lexicon of Scapula is authority over the learned world, and if *baptizo* means to pour and sprinkle, why are not those significations to be found here?



I have open before me another lexicon with English definitions, and will proceed to quote *all* those which occur under *baptizo*. It is Donnegan's, edited by Prof. Patton, of Princeton College, and may be found easily at the bookstores. *Baptizo*, to immerse repeatedly into a liquid, to submerge — to soak thoroughly — to saturate; hence, to drench with wine. Metaphorically, to confound totally, — to dip in a vessel and draw. Pass. Perf., to be immersed. There are no more, and yet Mr. Towne declares that he has proved the word to mean pouring and sprinkling, as well as immersion, and that in this indeterminate character of it, all the lexicographers are agreed! Surely, it required courage to make that assertion. I lay no claim to such bravery.

This principle that *baptizo* has a specific signification, and therefore means to wet, wash, or cleanse only by implication, thus "*by its own force*" determining the way of applying water, is clearly set forth by those three great lexicographers of the New Testament, Schleusner, Wahl and Bretschneider, the last of whom says in his Theology, Part II. 673, "An entire immersion belongs to the *nature* of baptism." The same remark applies to Hedericus, Stephens, Suicer, Passow and Rost.

Moreover, we may cite many cases in which the word *baptizo*, by its own force, must determine the meaning of the sentence, and if it have not a specific signification, the sentence has no sense. For instance, βαπτειται ἡ ναυς, the ship is baptized. Now the lexicons agree in saying that this means, the ship is submerged, or sinks. (See Donnegan and others.) Now if *baptizo* denotes *any way* of applying water, who can tell what happened to the ship? Such phrases occur in history, as may be seen in Polybius and Xenophon; but according to this philology, which I reprobate and pronounce entirely false, no one could tell whether the writer meant to say that the dew fell upon the vessel, or that the spray dashed over the prow, or that she was wet by a shower of rain, or that the sailors cleansed the deck, or that she sprung aleak, or that the waves washed the sides, or that she was launched, or that she was purified by some ceremony. Here order is turned into confusion.

Josephus, (Antiq. 9, 10, 2,) speaking of Jonah in the storm on his voyage to Tarshish, says the seamen would not throw him overboard, until the vessel was about to sink, or be baptized. Here the word in question by its own force determines the sense.

Again, how void of sense is this passage in Strabo, Lib. 16, unless the word before us has the character we assign to it. Speaking of the lake Sirbon, he says the bitumen floats on the surface, because of the nature of the water, which does not admit of diving, nor can any one who enters it be baptized, (or sink,) but is borne up.

I could fill pages with such citations, if it were necessary or desirable, showing that if the word does not *determine* mode, there is no clue to the author's meaning. But then it may be asked, what is to be done with those examples, which Mr. T. says, prove that *bapto* means to pour or sprinkle? Let us take them up, and see whether they sustain his assertion, or prove an extreme eagerness to force on the word a meaning which does not necessarily belong to it.

In his first example from Callimachus, he says the word *baptize*, means to "*draw up.*" "To-day, ye bearers of water baptize none" — that is, "draw up none." Now here the word has its usual meaning, "dip." The phrase is "*mē baptete.*" "To-day, ye bearers of water, dip not," that is, your pitchers in the river Inachus. Just so Aristotle says, (Quæst. Mechan. c. 29,) "the bucket must first be dipped — *bapsai* — and then draw up." Hence Donnegan's Lexicon says, under *Bapto*, "to draw out water *by dipping* a vessel into it." Yet Mr. T. says, this example proves that *bapto* has a meaning short of immersion! It reminds me of the saying of a celebrated logician: "How few there are who know when a thing is proved!"

His next example is from Hippocrates, who, speaking of a certain liquid, says, "when it *drops* upon the garments, they are dyed, (baptized.)" Mr. T.'s comment is, "observe, the dropping of the liquid is called baptism." To which I reply, "Observe, the dropping of the liquid is called — dropping; but the *effect* of the process, which was to make a garment look as if it had been dipped in

coloring matter, is designated by a word, which by *implication* means to dye, as all lexicographers agree." To illustrate the fallacy of Mr. Towne's criticism, let us suppose for a moment that he were a Greek, studying English, and wished to know the meaning of the word *dip*. First of all, he would naturally turn to a lexicon, and I will suppose him to use one as comprehensive as Richardson's English Dictionary, which I have now before me, in two quarto volumes. There he finds the history of the word traced. "*Dip*. [Anglo-Saxon — Dippan — mergere, immergere — to dip — to dive. Dutch, Dippen, Doppen. Sw. Dopa.] to sink, to immerge, to put under water or other liquid, to depress, to sink below the surface, to enter or go superficially or slightly *into* any thing. Consequentially, to wet, to damp." Overlooking the principle involved in the word "*consequentially*," he says to himself, the word *dip*, means to wet — to damp. Then meeting such a passage as this in Milton's *Comus*,

— "a cold shuddering dew  
*Dips* me all o'er."

he gravely reasons thus with himself: "The word *dip*, may mean sometimes to immerse. But the cold dew, *falls on* one, and wets by a gentle sprinkling. I will remember therefore that the word *dip*, means to sprinkle." Now I ask, if he should persist in calling the act of sprinkling dipping, and appeal to Milton for authority, how would an English school-boy correct his mistake? Simply by informing him that the word *dip* means to immerse, and that the poet means to denote the *effect* of the dew, rendering one as wet as if he had been dipped.

This illustration may suffice to expose the fallacy and the folly of a vast host of Pædobaptist criticisms on this word; criticisms put forth by a comparatively small number of the clergy in England and America. For on the continent of Europe, the really learned have rarely if at all exposed themselves to such a censure. Let it then be borne in mind, that if Mr. Towne can prove in any way that *bapto* means to pour or sprinkle, on the same principle I will prove that to dip means to pour or sprinkle. I will bring as many examples from English literature to

prove the latter, as he will bring from Greek literature to prove the former. Such a passage as this from Spencer would be quite to the point. Of Hope he says,

“ She always smyl'd, and in her hand did hold,  
An holy-water sprinkler dipt in dew,  
With which she sprinkled favors manifold  
On whom she list.”

How evident it is that as the dew *fell in drops* on the instrument called a sprinkler, that the word “dip,” there means sprinkled. In the same way it can be verily proved that the word *immerse* means to sprinkle, and to sprinkle may mean to immerse. And in fact that not one word in the English language specifies with invariable certainty any one way of applying water. Surely, “words are but air!”

As these remarks on a false principle of interpretation will apply to the use which Mr. T. makes of most of his examples, I will only notice one or two more, which being printed in capitals, he probably deemed particularly important. “Homer in his battle of the frogs and mice says: He fell and breathed no more, and the lake was tinged with the purple blood! Was the lake immersed in the blood of a mouse?” It may not be necessary for me to do it, but I will just hold a candle to the reader. I will quote from an English poet, and then ask a question. Cowley, in the *Davideis*, Book II. says,

“ Still does he glance the fortune of that day,  
When *drowned* in his own blood Goliath lay,  
And covered half the plain.”

My question is: Can a man be drowned in the blood that he has carried in his veins? You answer, No. I ask then, do you not see that to *drown* means to sprinkle or bedew? You reply at once that I have quoted from a work of imagination; that the poet has used a *hyperbole*; that one design of a hyperbole is to magnify an object, and that though I could not see the propriety of the figure without understanding the literal meaning, yet it is absurd to look for that meaning in such a case. Having once gotten the literal meaning, we can see its manifold applica-

tion in figures ; but for us, figurative language can have no existence unless we first learn what is literal. A school-boy who is so far advanced as to master the elements of rhetoric can see this ; but such noble authors as Kaimes and Whately write in vain for theologians who have a favorite point to carry.

This use which some defenders of sprinkling have made of Homer's battle of the frogs, reminds me of a poem once made by a playful student on another sort of battle, namely, with some bugs which had been crushed upon his bed. The line which I refer to was, "Lo, my couch is drenched in gore." If any thing like this had occurred in a Greek writer, a few among the clergy of our day would have stood ready to assert that the word translated "drenched," means to sprinkle. And what candid inquirer cannot see, that a position must be false which requires men to trample down the plainest rules of speech, and to argue on principles that would overturn the very foundations of order in language ?

The reply of the Sibyl touching the destiny of Athens, Mr. T. puts all in capitals, as if he thought it decisive. His quotation is, "Thou mayest be baptized, O Bladder, but it is not permitted to thee to go under the water." He takes it from Plutarch's life of Theseus. His comment on it is, "this floating upon the water is called baptism." I might well insert a note of admiration here, but I forbear. Let his inquirer just turn to the translation of Plutarch. It is a common book, and found in most of the stores. The first life recorded is that of Theseus. The answer of the Sibyl is there in a single line :

"The bladder may be dipped, but never drowned."

This is poetry and good sense ; the other rendering is nonsense. The design of the oracle was to represent Athens as overwhelmed, pressed down with calamities, yet rising again by its own energy as soon as that pressure is taken off ; and the idea of complete submersion was *essential* to that design.

So far is floating from meaning baptism, that Lucian in his dialogue of Simon the Man-hater, puts this expres-



sion in his mouth: "If I should see any one floating towards me on the rapid torrent, and he should beseech me to assist him, I would thrust him from me, *baptizing* him until he should rise no more." Admit Mr. T.'s definition of *baptizo*, the application of water in any mode, and the sense is destroyed.

In order to corroborate the statements I have made touching Mr. T.'s lexicography, I will just treat one or two English words in the same way he treats the word *baptizo*. I will take the word to *sail*, supposing an officer of the government to have before him a written document from some high authority, to sail to Nova Scotia. The word literally means "to pass by means of sails." A common man, without prejudice, would conclude a voyage by sea to be meant. But by consulting various authors, it is found that the word *sail*, "by its own force," does not determine any thing about the mode of conveyance. It is found that Milton's angels *sailed* through the air, "the eagle sails along the sky," the sailing kite was born by the gentle breeze, the man in a balloon sailed many miles, the moon "sailed through the heavens," the queen in her coach, full-robed, *sailed majestically along*, &c.; and the conclusion is, that the word *sail* means motion in general, and the command to sail to Nova Scotia, would be obeyed by walking, or riding, or going in a railroad car.

Just so, the command of Christ, "Drink ye all of it," might be evaded by one who wished to dispense with tasting wine in the Lord's supper. Common people suppose that the word *drink* in that command, means to "receive the liquid into the mouth and swallow it." But it is found by the learned, that the word means also "to absorb, to inhale, to take in eagerly, to salute with wine, to hear, to see, to wish well in the act of taking a cup." (See Johnson, Walker, Richardson.) The earth "drinketh in rain," the flowers drink the dew, the ears drink in sounds, the eyes "drink the light,"—from fingers dipped in vinegar the aching temples "drink refreshment." Evidently then, to drink does not mean to swallow, "but *receiving in any mode*; and so the divine command may be obeyed by inhaling fumes of wine, or letting it drop



upon the hands to be drank up by the pores. Absurd as this may seem, the candid inquirer will bear me out in saying, the philology is just as sound as that which asserts *baptizo* to mean the application of water in any mode that is possible.

On the philological principles of this Essay, I would defy Mr. T. or any Pædobaptist writer to cope successfully with the Universalists, when the meaning of the word *αιωνιον*, eternal, is in question. The one party as much as the other, violate a self-evident rule of criticism, thus stated by Ernesti, (p. 71,) "that the literal meaning is not to be deserted without evident reason or necessity;" and the Pædobaptists especially violate another canon stated by the same writer, "let not the translator commute genus for species, nor antecedent for consequent," page 100. Hence both parties feel a difficulty in translating the chief word, pertaining to their particular system. The Pædobaptists cannot find an Anglo-Saxon word to suit them, but must cover up the idea in the original Greek, and the Universalists, instead of giving us a word that is definite, in the English tongue, tell us of "an *aeonian* God, who regards all people with an *aeonian* love, has provided for them an *aeonian* salvation, together with an *aeonian* righteousness through which they shall now experience an *aeonian* consolation, and finally possess *aeonian* life in a *aeonian* kingdom; but if they reject and despise all this, they will be compelled to suffer *aeonian* punishment." The word expresses nothing with *certainty*.

Having dwelt thus long on Mr. T.'s lexicography, and set forth the principles on which the reader may dispose of all the examples he alledges, I proceed to consider his view of

#### THE TESTIMONY OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

His inquirer very properly asks if the Greek church do not practice immersion, and if they are not good authorities on such a question? Mr. T. objects to them as witnesses on account of their superstition; says that they do not always practice immersion, and are therefore against the *principle that it is essential to baptism*.

To this I answer, that as this controversy turns on the meaning of a Greek word, the superstition of the Greeks has nothing to do with their testimony as to its import. Suppose a question of great interest should arise in this city about the meaning of a word in the Mahometan Koran. That book was written in Arabic; and if there were in Asia a community who had always spoken Arabic, and had always had the Koran in their hands from the first, and the word in question had always been in common use among them, would any man of common sense say that their testimony were worth nothing? Does the superstition of an English sailor render him incompetent to tell the meaning of the word *sail*? Does the superstition of any man among us, affect his competency to testify to the meaning of the word *sprinkle*? Now let it be remembered, that among the Greeks, *baptizo* is as common a word, as *sail*, or *sprinkle*, among us. It is one thing to ask a man's testimony to the import of a current term in his own language, and quite another thing to ask his opinion on a doctrine; and in this case, it is not so much the testimony of the Greek church, as of the Greek nation, which we desire.

Now in regard to the practice of the Greek church, the stress which they lay on immersion, and the reason for it, I have evidence before me sufficient to settle the question.

The first testimony I shall adduce, is from a pamphlet published in Athens, in 1838, by Theocletus Pharmacides, Secretary of the Holy Synod of Greece. It seems that some of the Russian divines had been endeavoring to justify some sort of ablution short of immersion, as being the Christian rite. Pharmacides says: "But we ask the very pious Russian divines, where they found this two-fold mode of baptizing? Was it in the New Testament? But in that, *baptizo*, in the command of our Lord, 'Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' (Matt. xxviii. 19,) signifies nothing else than that which the same Greek word properly signifies. And this is manifest from the baptism of our Lord himself, who when he was baptized, *went up straightway out of the water*; (Matt. iii. 16;) but he who goes up out of the water, goes

down first into the water; that is, he is all baptized in it. One mode therefore of baptizing, we learn from the New Testament — that by immersion, (*καταδυσσεως*); and immersion is no other than an entire covering by means of or in water. Then again, the Russians were taught Christianity *by us*, and from their teachers they learned one and *only one* mode of baptizing. And do not the Russian divines know how much debate exists, and how much contention takes place, between us and those who receive sprinkling (*rantismou*) or pouring, instead of baptism? Sprinkling or pouring, instead of baptism, according to the proper signification of the word, was introduced into the church by the Latins, in the twelfth or thirteenth century, and they also have received it who have separated from the Latin church. And it is not yet probably an entire century since immersion as baptism was entirely disused in Germany. But that the verb *baptizo* in the New Testament signifies nothing other than what the verb properly signifies, we bring as a witness also a divine of the Latin church, Dr. Frederic Brenner.”

Pharmacides goes on to quote Dr. Brenner on the point, and then proceeds: “See here a divine of the Western church explains the word *baptizo*, in the command of Jesus Christ respecting baptism; and as he explains the word, other divines, of whatever church they may be, cannot but explain it. But since the Western church sprinkles or pours, and *does not baptize*, it is impossible that she should not wish to justify herself. Whence also Dr. Brenner brings after the above, reasons for sprinkling or pouring; but these arguments are very much forced, as is the conclusion.”

The next witness I shall bring, is from a pamphlet, entitled, “Catechism or Orthodox Doctrine of the Oriental Church, for the use of the Greek Youth. Published with the approbation of the Holy Synod: fourth edition, Athens, 1837.”

Page 26. Baptism is a mystery in which the body is washed (*louetai*) with water.

Page 27. The person baptized is submerged (*buthizetai*) in water, while the minister of Christ or priest pronounces these words, &c.

My third witness shall be the Bishop of the Cyclades, a member of the Synod of the Kingdom of Greece. His pamphlet was published in Athens in 1837, entitled, "Orthodox Doctrine." It is composed in verse. The plan of it is this: A young man, born of Greek parents in Washington in America, and baptized by a Greek priest who happened to be there, having been left untaught in the Greek religion, on account of the early death of the priest who baptized him, after having obtained an education, returns to the land of his ancestors. He finds himself ignorant of their religion. Fortunately he falls in the way of a presbyter, who kindly explains to him the things necessary to his salvation. This book is designed to be a brief system of theology, and at the same time to expose the dangers of those young Greeks who are educated in America! In regard to baptism, it says, (page 238,) "Let him who is about to be baptized and become a Christian, stand uncovered. At the same time the fonts must be capacious, that they may be full of water, so as to contain the whole body of the person baptized, even to the crown of the head; and that the water *may cover the hairs of the head.*"

Out of the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word shall be established; and yet I will add the testimony of one more, a Greek writer to whom Pharmacides refers with great respect, and well known in Europe, Alexander de Stourdza; who in a work entitled "Considerations on the Doctrine and Spirit of the Orthodox Church," published in Studgart in 1816, says: "The Western Church has done violence to the word and the idea of the rite, in practicing baptism by sprinkling, the very enunciation of which is a *ludicrous contradiction*. Baptism and immersion are identical."

What now should be thought of Mr. Towne's statement that the Greeks do not lay as much stress on immersion as the Baptists of this country? and also that "they are against the principle, that immersion is essential" to the ordinance? Has he known whereof he affirmed? Has he been misled, or has he failed to inform himself, and then spoken rashly? I can make no other supposition without impeaching his sincerity, which I would not do

by any means. But though a man be sincere, rashness connected with the want of knowledge, is certainly no virtue.

Let the testimony of the Greeks be weighed well. We ask not their opinion as to what good baptism will do, or under what circumstances it should be administered, or on any doctrine of the church; but their understanding of an important word, which is the same now in their every day speech, that it was in the time of Christ. There has been no change. The writings of the modern Greeks on the meaning of baptism, are conformed to their early Christian literature; as for instance, to the expressions of Chrysostom who says, that in baptism "our heads are submerged in water as in a tomb." (Hom. 25, in Joan.)

As I look around me here, and see the practice of sprinkling called baptism, I am led to ask whence it came? I press the question on the Oriental church, and she answers "not from me." She abjures it as an innovation which annihilates the ancient rite, and charges its introduction on the Papal church. I turn to the latter church and address the same question to her, and she acknowledges the saying of the Greek to be true. She declares that immersion was the primitive practice, but that by authority committed to her, *she changed it*. She admits the deed, and claims the right to do it. The large and beautiful marble baptisteries throughout her realm, the relics of many centuries, stand as monuments of a buried rite. Her scholars and her priests agree in understanding the Greek word, and the primitive practice as the Greeks themselves do. I turn to the Reformed churches, and their learned men, with the writings of the Reformers in their hands, declare in the language of Calvin, "the word *baptize* means to immerse, and *it is certain* that immersion was the practice of the primitive church,"\* yet plead for the change, since it is made on the ground of expediency or convenience. While these replies linger on my ear, my attention is roused by a few voices of the clergy of New England, denying what the learning of the old world has established, and making assertions in bold tones touching Greek literature, at which the learned Greeks,

\* CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, Art. 'Bap.'



Italians and Germans, of different churches and opposite opinions in theology, alike profoundly marvel.

Although the practice of immersion prevails so generally in the countries of the Eastern church, where the Pope never swayed a sceptre, yet because it is different in those which are or have been papal, Pædobaptist writers often represent us as setting ourselves against the decisions of a vast majority of the learned of Europe. This is an entire mistake. Whatever may be the practice of churches, determined as it has been by kings and parliaments, popes and cardinals, the learning of the world is on our side in this question. On no point within the whole compass of theology, is there so great a union of opinion, though not of practice, among the really learned of different nations, as is justly observed by the Secretary of the Synod of Greece. What though Calvin did not practice immersion? It is enough for me to know that he said "the word *baptizo*, means immerse, and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the primitive church." What though Luther did not practice immersion? It is enough for me to know that he asserted it to be the proper mode, as the only one "answering to the signification of baptism," and that he so rendered the Greek word in his German version of the New Testament. What though Melancthon did not practice immersion? I know that he gave it the suffrage of his judgment. I might say the same of Beza, Erasmus, Witsius, Venema, Turrettein, Spanheim, Grotius and Mosheim, the first of whom says, "*baptizo* does not signify to *wash* except by consequence," and the last of whom declares, "baptism was performed in the second century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font." (Eccl. Hist. Cent. I. II.) All the learning of modern Europe, and of the most celebrated critics now living, Greek, Catholic and Protestant, utters but one voice on this point. If the clear and positive testimony of the leading scholars of the universities of Germany will have any weight with Mr. Towne or the reader, they may find it in an article from Professor Sears, in the Christian Review for March, 1838. The Catholic Church, too, speak-



ing through such men as Bossuet of a former age, and of the present, Wiseman, now President of the English College at Rome, is strong in the assertion of the one meaning of the word, and of the ancient practice being in accordance with it, though her own is not so. Let it be remembered therefore, that the literature of the world is with us, and then let it be asked, whether Mr. Towne can be justified in charging us with arrogance for maintaining a position which the wisest men of every age have proved to be right? Is assumption on our side, or on his?

Nor is Tyndal, the father of our present English version, to be left out of this list. Mr. T. places the weight of his opinion on the side of sprinkling. Whatever may have been Tyndal's practice, we have his express testimony to the scriptural character of our view of baptism. In a comment on Eph. v. 26, after reprobating the conduct of the Romish clergy in using a Latin form of words, he says: "Now as a preacher in preaching the word of God, saveth the hearers that believe, so doeth the washinge, in that it preacheth and representeth to us the promise that God hath made unto us in Christe; *the washinge preacheth* unto us that we are clesed wyth Christe's bloude shedyng, which was an offering and a satisfaction for the synne of al that repent and beleve, consentynge and submyttinge themselves unto the wyl of God.\* The *plungynge into the water signifyeth* that we die and are buried with Christe, as consarning the old life of synne which is Adam. And the *pulling out again, signifyeth that we rise again with Christe* in a new life, full of the Holy Gooste, which shall teach us and gyde us, and work the wyl of God in us, as thou seest, Rom. vi." This passage occurs in a work, entitled, "The Obedience of all Degrees, proved by God's Worde," imprinted by William Copland, at London, 1561. Probably Mr. Towne was not aware of the existence of such a passage from

\* So Cowper:

"There is a fountain filled with blood,  
 Drawn from Immanuel's veins;  
 And sinners plunged beneath that flood,  
 Lose all their guilty stains."

the pen of Tyndal, or he would not have not spoken as he has done.

We may see then who, in this controversy, are Mr. T.'s real opponents. First, *all the Greek nation*, who are competent witnesses of the meaning of a term in their native tongue. Secondly, all the learned of other nations in Europe, who feel that in their assertions they have any reputation to risk *as scholars*. Though these latter practiced sprinkling, yet they did not do it on the ground that the word *baptizo* meant sprinkle, or that such was the practice of the apostolic age. Like the Catholics, these Protestants plead for it on the ground of expediency, convenience, or church authority. Mr. T. knowing that a free community, educated like ours, will not ultimately hold to the practice on *such grounds*, feels himself bound to support it by the Bible, or give it up, and is thence driven to make the most daring and reckless assertions. He seems dissatisfied with the moderate statements of Dr. Woods and Prof. Stuart, and apologizes for what he calls their "concessions," as arising from their liberality. But those venerable veterans in controversy have made the very best of their cause, and after all, it is the only point within the compass of theology on which they lose their wonted strength. See how Mr. T. arrays his scholarship against the leading men of every church. He says the word means to *sprinkle and pour!* Weigh the statement against that of Beza, the author of Latin poems, the Professor of Greek at Lausanne, the colleague of Calvin and the translator of the New Testament, yet not a Baptist in *practice*: "Baptizo does not signify to wash except by consequence, for it properly signifies to immerse for the sake of dyeing. To be baptized in water, signifies no other than to be immersed in water; which is the external ceremony of baptism." (Epistola II. ad Thom. Silium, Amotat in Marc. vii. 4, &c.) So Dr. Wall, one of the "Lights of the English church," who wrote more largely than any man in England in favor of infant baptism, says that immersion was the *primitive practice*, and that "*this is so plain and clear*, that one cannot but pity the weak endeavors of such Pædobaptists as would maintain the negative of it. 'T is a great want of prudence as well as

of honesty, to refuse to grant to an adversary what is certainly true and may be proved so. It creates a jealousy of all the rest that one says." So I might mention Dr. Campbell, of the Scotch church, principal of Aberdeen College, who made Hume actually ashamed of his argument on miracles, and was indeed the greatest biblical critic of the age in Great Britain, in one of his theological lectures, urging the exercise of candor on young ministers, cites as a ridiculous instance of the want of it, the case of those who deny that immerse is an adequate translation of *baptizo*, merely for the sake of party effect. And without going further, weigh the statement against that of Bossuet of the Catholic church, the Bishop of Meaux, who says, "John's baptism was performed by plunging. In fine, we read not in the scripture that baptism was otherwise administered; and we are able to make it appear by the acts of councils and by the ancient rituals, that for thirteen hundred years, baptism was thus administered *throughout the whole church*, as far as was possible."

Again I say, let the reader judge on which side is arrogance and assumption; on mine or that of my opponent.

If what I have now advanced in regard to the lexicography of the word in question be true, then Mr. Towne's whole argument is destroyed. It is not necessary for me to proceed further. All those trifling suggestions about the inconvenience of immersion, to the apostles and others, are swept away. The error must then die of itself. If I have crushed the head of the serpent, I may well let the tail alone. Nevertheless, a few words on Mr. T.'s treatment of several passages of scripture may meet the wants of some inquirers. I will proceed therefore briefly to notice his objections to our views of the

## BAPTISMS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. *John's Baptism.* It is useless in this connection to discuss the question whether John's baptism is to be called Christian or not. The New Testament has but one *name* for the ordinance, by whomsoever administered, and the *act* must have been the same. John's baptism came "from

heaven." Jesus received it, and the disciples had no other. If, as we have proved, baptism means immersion, then John immersed. But Mr. T. cannot see how it was possible for John to immerse so many people as resorted to him, in a year and a half. "The passage of scripture cannot import less than five hundred thousand." This reminds me of Voltaire's objection to the narrative of the slaughter of the infants, in the second of Matthew. Why, he says, Herod must have slain fourteen thousand; and how was it possible that the other historians should not have noticed it? This will do very well for a skeptic, but it is absurd for a Christian to place his *guess* in such a case, against a plain statement of the Bible. No number is mentioned; but he *guesses* how many there were, and then guesses about John's amount of strength, and concludes by putting these *guesses* in print as an argument!

It is said again that the phrase translated "much water, means 'many springs.' The plural form decides this point." Astonishing! And yet the same evangelist uses the same phrase in Rev. xiv. 2, to denote the "deep-sounding sea." By this we may judge of Mr. T.'s philology, and of the way in which he makes words, "by their own force," decide a point.

II. *The Baptism of Christ.* Most young Christians would naturally feel an interest in their Saviour's baptism, and would wish, if it were possible, to be baptized as he was. And as the record in the third chapter of Matthew always suggests the idea of immersion, millions have hence believed that the Saviour was immersed. Special effort is therefore made to neutralize the force of this example. First we are informed that Christ's baptism was not Christian. It was only a "Jewish ceremony." The Mosaic law, he says, "required *every priest* to be consecrated to his work by being washed with water; Lev. viii. 6; and as this is the only statute in the code which made it necessary for him to be baptized, there is no doubt but this is the statute to which he referred." Now there is one passage of scripture which sweeps all this away. It is Heb. vii. 14, where Paul says, "it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moses *spake nothing* concerning priesthood." Here the

apostle asserts, that no statute of the Mosaic law touched the priesthood of Christ, who (verse 13) “pertaineth to *another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar.*” Had Mr. T. never read this passage, or did he forget it?

He adds, that we must “either admit that this was the design of Christ’s baptism, or deny that he fulfilled all righteousness.” Only think of this! how dispassionate! We must either admit that Jesus was baptized as a Jewish priest under the law of Moses, or else deny the Saviour’s words to John: “Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.” I must leave our author and Paul to settle this. It was the Holy Spirit who indited the seventh of Hebrews.

The next statement on Christ’s baptism is equally astounding. “The ceremonial law required that the washing of the priests, (Lev. viii. 6,) when consecrated to their office, should be performed by sprinkling. Num. viii. 7. According to the scriptures, therefore, Jesus our Priest was sprinkled.” All I ask is, that the reader will peruse the law of consecration in the eighth chapter of Numbers, and then ask himself if Jesus fulfilled that at Jordan?

In what sense then did Christ fulfil righteousness by his baptism? I answer, the term righteousness here denotes *practical obedience*, as in Luke i. 6. And baptism was a part of Christ’s obedience “as a son,” because it was an *appointment of the Father*, that thus he should be made “manifest to Israel.” John knew not the Messiah personally, nor under what circumstances or at what time he should see him. But he knew that the *circumstances* were appointed. The *event* made it plain. Such is John’s own account. See John, i. 31, 33. “And I knew him not, *but that he should be made manifest to Israel*, therefore am I come, baptizing with water. And I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, *the same said unto me*, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God.” In baptism, therefore, Christ is our example; and it is our duty for the same reason that it was his; namely, *it is an appointment of God.*



III. *The Baptism of the Three Thousand.* Mr. T. thinks that the three thousand converts on the day of Pentecost could not have been immersed, because *there was not water enough in the city; the brook Cedron was dry, and no suitable place could be found.* Is it possible that Mr. Towne should have allowed himself to write this, when Dr. Robinson's work on Palestine has been so long before the public? In that the answer is complete. In vol. I. sec. vii. 9, there is an article of nineteen pages on the supply of water in Jerusalem. 'The extent of the cisterns, reservoirs, fountains and pools, for all the purposes of life, appeared truly amazing to the Doctor, who observes, that "in the numerous sieges to which Jerusalem in all ages has been exposed, we no where read of a want of water within the city."

But Mr. T. says, "the Jews would sooner have admitted the swine to the baths than the disciples." See Acts ii. 46, 47. "They were daily in the temple, praising God, \* \* *having favor with all the people.*"

So I might proceed to mention all the little improbabilities and inconveniences which a fertile imagination has thrown up, to discredit the obvious sense of the record of baptisms in the Acts of the Apostles. Proceeding in the same spirit, I could just as easily throw uncertainty and great doubtfulness over the records of some of our own missionaries in Burmah. If Dr. Judson had written some of his communications in Greek, I could show just as plausibly the great improbability that by the word *baptizo* he always meant immerse. Just so in regard to Oncken in Germany; in cases where he has baptized in great haste, and amidst great trials, I could suggest a multitude of difficulties of the same sort, against understanding his accounts always to involve the idea of immersion. One of the best attested facts in history, is, that on the 16th of April, 404, Chrysostom immersed three thousand Catechumens, young persons who had been instructed in Christianity at Constantinople. This he did with the assistance of none but the clergy of his own church. And yet there are as many improbabilities to be suggested against this statement as against any of the missionary accounts in the Acts of the Apostles.



Mr. T. well observes, that "this controversy touches more than the simple question of immersion." Ay, — it does indeed. It touches the fundamental principles on which all languages are to be interpreted; for on those adopted here, there is not a page of the Bible which gives forth a definite meaning. No controversy can be settled, "shadows, clouds, and darkness rest upon the prospect," and skepticism becomes the dictate of wisdom, because faith can have no foundations.

The number of instances in which this work betrays ignorance, or forgetfulness of plain scripture facts, is quite startling. The writer speaks as if the Jews knew nothing of religious immersions. He says that the Apostles "had been educated to regard sprinkling as *sufficient* for ceremonial purification, and from early childhood had seen the leper and the Levites, and indeed the vessels of the temple cleansed by sprinkling." This is something like a statement which President Beecher, of Illinois, has ventured to make on the same subject. He says, "Nor is the washing of the clothes, so often spoken of, enjoined by a word denoting immersion." Now for the refutation of this, just turn to Numbers xxxi. 21, 23. "This is the ordinance of the law which the Lord commanded Moses. Every thing that may abide the fire ye shall make it go through the fire, and it shall be clean; nevertheless it shall be purified with the water of separation; and all that abideth not the fire, ye shall make *go through the water*." Now this passage has been in the Bible ever since these writers were boys, and how is it, that to all intents and purposes they never saw it? Very different from theirs is the statement of Calmet, as edited by Dr. Robinson. He says, "the priests and Levites before they exercised their ministry, washed themselves. (Ex. xxix. 4; Levit. viii. 6.) All legal pollutions were cleansed by baptism, or plunging into water. To touch a dead body, &c., required purification. These purifications were not uniform; generally, people dipped themselves entirely under the water, and this is the most simple notion of the word *baptize*." (See the article, Baptism.) It is asked with a tone of triumph, in relation to Mark vii. 4, whether the Jews immersed their *beds*. If any one doubt the

possibility of this, let him read the article in Calmet on Beds; and as to the fact, the Jewish canon in Maimonides runs thus: "A bed wholly defiled, if he dips it part by part, it is pure." Their beds were not like ours. Again the Jewish rule is, "if any man wash himself all over, except the top of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness." Is not a Jewish Rabbi, from whom the learned have quoted seven centuries, better authority on Jewish customs than a New England clergyman?

Again. Mr. T. has insisted with some stress, that when the eunuch read that passage quoted in the 8th. of Acts from the 53d of Isaiah, he must have just received an idea of sprinkling from the last verse of the 52d chapter: "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." Now in the septuagint version, published in Greek, two hundred and eighty-five years before Christ, this word rendered *sprinkle* is translated *astonish*, (*thaumasontai*.) Then it would read,

"So shall he astonish many nations;  
Kings shall shut their mouths at him."

The parallelism so prevalent in Hebrew poetry confirms this version. Gesenius in his Hebrew Lexicon sanctions it and throws light on its origin. Mr. T. says that "Immersioners, in their anxiety to evade the point of this argument, find fault with our translators for following the original Hebrew in this place, and not preferring the translation of the Seventy. But this evasion is insufficient." Strange assertion! Here I ask, did not Mr. T. know that the version of the Seventy is the *very one* from which Luke *quotes the passage in question*? The Evangelist himself takes the text of the Seventy, word for word! And well he might, for by that Greek version, foreigners became acquainted with the Old Testament, and as Rosenmuller says, "the Eunuch was undoubtedly reading that version, for he does not appear to have been taught Hebrew." See then how the Greek text of Luke overturns Mr. T.'s argument on this point, so that his labor is lost, and his censure on us is shared by an inspired Evangelist!

In theological discussion nothing has a more injurious influence on the mind of a good man, than the yielding

up of the feelings to the domination to a party spirit. And nothing is a stronger indication of this, than the practice of warping scripture to suit a purpose. I was struck with an instance of it a day or two since in looking at a little work of Rev. Mr. Winslow, on Baptism, who in quoting Leviticus xiv. 6, to establish his point, has left out the last three words, which materially affect the sense. I should be pained to think that he had done this by design, but am inclined to believe that he copied the quotation from another, inasmuch as I know the same thing to have been done by a previous writer.

In taking leave of the work before me, I cannot but express the hope that whatever controversy this subject may yet occasion here, all appeals to party prejudice may be avoided. Against this, the love of truth is the only safeguard. In such cases, nothing is more easy than a retort, but of what avail can it be? The learned Dr. Wall professed himself ashamed of "the profane scoffs" of writers on his own side, against immersion; and deeming it most probable, as he did, that Jesus himself, that Mary the mother of our Lord, "the other Mary," and the "holy women" who were much with Christ, received baptism in this way, his religion kept the door of his lips, and prevented him from uttering against it the charge of being indecorous or unseemly for persons of either sex, or any rank. Harsh epithets and insinuations against one's motives do not require much research. As for myself, if I had written on this subject for mere party ends, I should own that I had committed a great sin, and without repentance I should expect to meet the frown of my Judge in the final day. Let me but be convinced that our Saviour in his last command to his disciples did not enjoin "any particular way" of applying water in the initiatory rite which he appointed, and it would cost me no sacrifice openly to avow my belief. For in taking my position as a Baptist, I did not yield to the prejudice of education, or the current of sympathy, or the prevailing custom, but was "driven in spirit" to do so from the light of truth and the dictates of conscience. Seeing Christ's command to be explicit, I saw that it was at my peril to disobey, since he had said, "he that loveth me not,

keepeth not my sayings." Acknowledged as it is on all hands that baptism is an *initiatory* ordinance, that it precedes communion, just as an oath of office precedes all the acts peculiar to it, I perceived that it was no bigotry in any church to insist on the connection. The great question before me was this: What does the command of Christ mean? During the third year of my course in college, I spent days and nights in the investigation of it. If at any time a plausible argument against immersion made a temporary impression, the simple study of the Bible would erase it, till at last I was constrained to differ from a circle of most endeared associates, some of whom are now in heathen lands and some in heaven, and to go forth in baptism, "following the Lord fully," saying "thy word giveth light, and *thy law is the truth*."

Acquainted as I have been with a host of theological students of Pædobaptist denominations, I cannot but utter my sincere conviction, that if before committing themselves publicly to the ministry they would examine this subject closely and prayerfully, their conclusions would be very different from what they are. How many commence an examination apparently in good earnest, and soon finding themselves sorely pressed to differ from their beloved friends, begin to falter; and ere long, coolly saying, "well, it is non-essential," abandon the matter entirely. Hence follows an indifference to the whole subject, or else a morbid sensitiveness, which renders the very mention of it painful. But if all candidates for the Christian ministry would at the outset adopt the maxim of Chillingworth, "the Bible, the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants," very soon would the unity of the primitive church be restored, and all rejoice again in owning "ONE LORD, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM."

## APPENDIX.

---

It has been my chief design in the foregoing Reply to show the true meaning of the word *baptizo*, on which this whole controversy turns; for if that be settled, all arguments against immersion are utterly invalid, derived as they must be from custom, inconvenience, church authority, or mere conjecture. Hence I have omitted to notice several minor points connected with the subject, as of comparatively no importance. But as the printer informs me that there is a blank page at the end of his form, I subjoin one or two remarks.

It is well known that Baptists have generally regarded Paul's expression in Rom. vi. 4, *buried with him by baptism into death, &c.*, as an allusion to the ancient practice of immersion. Mr. T. has written nearly nine pages to show that there is no such reference. I have already quoted Tyndal's opinion on that point, and might quote to the same effect, the opinions of the learned writers of every church and every age. But Mr. T. asserts that there is no allusion to the outward act of baptism at all. It relates, he says, to spiritual purification. His strong argument is one which he puts in italics, with two notes of admiration following. "Mark it, if the burial is literal, the death is literal also. If there must be a literal burial, there must *be a literal death!!*" Now a few words will dispose of this. Let Paul himself answer it. He marks the point of similitude. He says, "we are buried with him by baptism into death, that **LIKE AS CHRIST** *was raised up* from the dead, so we should walk in newness of life." I ask then, was Christ's resurrection a *literal* resurrection or not? Was that only a spiritual resurrection? Why, this is neology. Some of the Transcendentalists (so called) speak in this way, and the author of Charles Elwood comes very near it; but I should grieve



to think that such a man as Mr. T. had adopted a principle of interpretation that would lead to it. We believe that in the case of our Saviour, there was a *literal* burial and a *literal* resurrection, and that the initiatory rite of the church, sets forth this glorious fact in a visible emblem. Let any candid inquirer read I Pet. iii. 21, leaving out the parenthesis for the sake of connecting the first and last parts of the verse together, and see if there the apostle does not assert that baptism exhibits in a *figure* the resurrection of Christ.

On page 61, it is said that *most of the immersions in this country, were derived from Roger Williams*. If Mr. T. had not the means of knowing the reverse of this to be true, his library ought to be better supplied; if he had the means of knowledge, he ought not to have made this assertion. Very few baptisms in this land trace their pedigree to this source.\* When New England was settled, the Baptists abounded in our father-land, and many emigrated here who were Baptists, while Roger Williams was a priest of the Church of England. During the Commonwealth, the number and progress of the Baptists in England astonished all beholders. In 1663, a *whole church*, with their pastor, Rev. John Miles, emigrated from Swansea in Wales to Wannamoiset, which now bears the name of Swansea, and is a town of Massachusetts. In Wales it is well known the Baptists have existed from the earliest times, whose history, as Mosheim says respecting the Dutch Baptists, "is hidden in the depths of antiquity." †

On page 15, Ewing is classed with standard lexicographers. He is a Congregational minister of Scotland, and has written with ardor in favor of infant baptism. His arguments should be fairly considered, but his *authority* as a lexicographer in this case, is worth nothing. Mr. T. might as well appeal to his coadjutor in the work before us, as philological authority.

\* Knowles' Memoir of Roger Williams.

† Eccl. Hist. Cent. 16, Sec. 3, Chap. 3, p. 1.



STRICTURES

ON

MR. HAGUE'S REVIEW

OF

HINTS TO AN INQUIRER

ON THE SUBJECT OF

BAPTISM.

---

BY PARSONS COOKE AND JOSEPH H. TOWNE.

---

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY WASHINGTON CLAPP.

1842.

---

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1842,  
BY WASHINGTON CLAPP,  
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

---

#### NOTE.

WE learn that complaint has been made of our printing the whole of Mr. Hague's pamphlet with ours. We know it is common in such discussions to bandy complaints of *garbling*. But a complaint for *not garbling*, that is, for publishing the whole with its answer, is a new thing under the sun. If the matter of complaint be, that in this series Mr. H. has not the last word,—he stands in the same position as the respondent in a court of justice, where the party opening makes the closing plea. Besides, that difficulty can be easily remedied. If he will make out a reply, and print it in a page in uniform with ours, so that the whole can be bound together, we will be happy, at reasonable rates, and at half the expense at which he can do it, to furnish him as many copies of the series as he may wish to bind with his own, giving him in them the last word.

If the complaint be, that our publishing his work curtails the sale by his publishers, we leave any one to judge, whether we curtail it as much as we expand it, by the mere fact of replying to it. Besides, his publishers, in putting it forth without securing the copyright, as they might have done for a trifle, virtually gave it to the public, and have no legal or moral right, and no right on the score of courtesy, to complain of any one for publishing it.

---

STEREOTYPED BY  
GEORGE A. CURTIS,  
NEW ENGLAND TYPE AND STEREOTYPE FOUNDRY.

**S T R I C T U R E S**  
ON  
**REV. WILLIAM HAGUE'S REVIEW**  
OF  
**"HINTS ON BAPTISM."**

---

**BY PARSONS COOKE AND JOSEPH H. TOWNE.**

---

MR. HAGUE'S Review of our Hints on the subject of Baptism, we have concluded to publish with our reply, and our first pamphlet; that the scope of each may be understood at a glance. Since our immersing brethren have thought that a reply to our pamphlet was called for, we are pleased that Mr. Hague should have become our respondent. If their cause is made to appear in a disadvantageous light, they will not be able to impute it to any incompetency of its advocate.

We choose not to reciprocate the compliments so liberally bestowed by Mr. Hague in assertions of our ignorance. When commencing a discussion, we love to feel that we have to do with a man who understands his subject, and with whom it is reputable for us to contend. A good cause needs not the aid of disrespectful insinuations. Since, as Mr. Hague suggests, courtesy is on the list of Christian duties, one of his standing for intelligence and probity cannot fail to regret, that he has suffered many indiscretions to escape him. We are well aware, that whoever embarks in any controversy is in danger of losing here and there his self-possession. The ability to dispute without any symptoms of irritation is a rare attainment. We shall endeavor, however, so far as we have any-

thing to do with the present controversy, to keep before us one simple object, namely, the illustration and defence of the truth. We fully agree with the learned Dr. Wall, that remarks designed merely to wound the feelings of an opponent do not require much research.

Mr. Hague takes exception to our use of the term "Immersers," and intimates it to be "a contemptuous epithet." That we had no invidious design, must appear from our serious disclaimer, and the reasons given in advance, why justice to ourselves demanded the use of the term. (See page 4.) Mr. Hague will not contend that the word itself does of its own force carry contempt with it, for it is a first principle in his theory, that *immerse* is the word by which *baptize* should have been translated; and that the word *baptize*, and of course Baptists, do not rightfully occupy a place within the territory of the English language. So strong indeed has been the preference of his brethren for *immerse* as a substitute for *baptize*, that they have found it needful to rend the Bible Society, and to procure a new translation of the inspired volume, for the single purpose of introducing their favorite word. Surely they will not say that to call them Immersers is to speak of them contemptuously. Already has one of their newspapers announced the appearance of this new Bible in our city. We would ask Mr. Hague, if the new translation does not call John the Baptist, "John the Immerser?" If it does, or if it uses some equivalent phrase, we appeal from Mr. Hague, to the law and testimony found in that Bible, to prove that Immerser is by no necessity a contemptuous epithet.

Mr. Hague says, "With equal reason the Baptists might say—We will not call Congregationalists by the name which they have assumed, because we also are Congregationalists." If our calling ourselves Congregationalists were accompanied with a denial that they are Congregationalists, as their assumption of the name of Baptists is accompanied by a denial that we baptize, his statement would then be true. But is it so? His allusion to the case of Episcopalians is equally unfortu-

nate ;—for *prelate* and *prelacy* seemed to have been coined to avoid the implication that other sects have no bishops. See Milton's prose works, *passim*. To beg the question in their very name, is the common artifice of sects.

When Mr. Hague reproves us for "striving about words," he forgets that *his main argument is about a word*, to wit, baptizo. It seems that *a word* is all-important in the one case, and in the other not worth striving for! But Mr. Hague really considers this change of his denominational name a serious affair, and evidently fears the consequences of it. He is too discerning not to see that the substitution of Immersers for Baptists would dissolve a charm by which multitudes are now so completely spell-bound that they cannot appreciate sound argument.

In bringing under examination Mr. Hague's reply to us, we shall first call attention to some important points of our argument, which he has passed over in silence.

#### IMPORTANT MATTERS OMITTED BY MR. HAGUE.

The reader will please to notice, that the points of our argument which he has omitted, are such, that, if they are conceded, the question is settled against immersion. In his appendix, he says, "Hence I have omitted to notice several minor points, connected with the subject, as of comparatively no importance."

These points are, first, our whole argument drawn from *the signification of the rite*. This argument we consider of itself decisive of the whole question; and notwithstanding what may be said on other points, while this argument remains unscathed, we hold firmly our ground against immersion. Verbal criticisms offset against the force of *facts* will not satisfy. Let then the reader turn back, and review our remarks on the signification of the rite, as a branch of our argument which Mr. Hague omits as "*of comparatively no importance.*"

Another of these “*minor points*” is *our whole chapter on Burial with Christ in Baptism*. Aware that Immersers are wont to place great stress on their argument from those figurative expressions, which represent believers as buried with Christ, we determined to make its fallacy apparent to every reader. We believed that we had succeeded; and were confirmed in that impression, when we found that our observations on that subject were passed over by Mr. Hague with merely a brief notice. It is well known, that the argument derived from this source has been of all others the most popular with Immersers. Let the reader then not lose sight of the fact, that, if Mr. Hague has not abandoned this argument altogether, he has placed it among those “OF COMPARATIVELY NO IMPORTANCE.”

He is also very willing to slide over our suggestions as to *the presumptive evidence against immersion*. He has indeed a more plausible excuse for this, in that this kind of evidence is not of itself proof against an express command of God, if such a command exist. Yet it is to the point, so far as to show, how clear and decisive a command should be made. If a rite is proposed for our adoption,—which in form departs from its declared design—which conflicts with the simplicity of the gospel—which is not fitted for universal practice—which is not suited to all times and seasons—which cannot be administered to persons under all circumstances—which is cumbersome and inconvenient—which makes the bearing of the cross to be of the nature of popish penance, and which violates modesty and decency; we may for these reasons lawfully demand strong and indisputable proof that God has indeed commanded us to observe such a rite. And although Mr. Hague has thought it best to slide over our suggestions on this point, his intelligent readers will not be so easily persuaded to follow his example.

Mr. Hague attempts no reply to what is said in our pamphlet respecting *the degree of certainty which his cause demands*. We gave prominence to the fact, that the principle



of unchurching all Christians, who have not been immersed, lays Immersers under obligation to make out *a certainty* that our Lord has commanded immersion, and that they have no warrant to rend the church on the ground of a mere conjecture. This issue, so repeatedly tendered to him, he practically evades. He is evidently anxious that his readers should consider the question one of balancing probabilities. He wishes them to peruse his pages with the impression, that he has no more to prove than his antagonists. We, therefore, call the special attention of the reader to this point. The close-communion theory, being necessarily based on a claim of infallibility, touching the subject of baptism, binds Mr. Hague to make out his case to a complete certainty; while, on the other hand, as we hold no such theory, we have only to prove that there is no such certainty. If we can array against immersion only a slight probability, our cause is gained;—for then Mr. Hague's certainty vanishes. Now let the candid reader take Mr. Hague's pamphlet, and, shutting all opposing arguments from his mind, read it by itself, and say whether he has made out more than a mere probability. If he has not, he is judged, out of his own mouth, to hold without a warrant (because without a certainty) an attitude of hostility to the peace and union of Christ's kingdom.

#### WHAT MR. HAGUE HAS ATTEMPTED TO PROVE.

He has judged it expedient to lay out his main strength in an attempt to prove, that the requirement for immersion inheres in the very word baptize. In order to sustain his position, he labors to show that the word signifies **IMMERSE, AND NOTHING ELSE**. The reader will then understand that the question is not, whether the word sometimes means to immerse, *but whether it always has this signification, and no other*. Hence, if Mr. Hague should multiply volumes of instances in which this word signifies to immerse, it would avail nothing, unless he should clearly show, at the same time, that it has **NO OTHER MEANING**. While, on the

other hand, if we can bring proof that the word has even one other meaning, his labor is lost. If the reader will run his eye over those instances which Mr. Hague adduces to prove his point, he will immediately see that they go no further than simply to show that the word, *in those cases*, means to immerse. He will then not fail to notice the all-pervading defect of Mr. Hague's argument. Proofs that the word *often means to immerse*, multiplied to any extent, are only proofs that the word *often means to immerse*. This we have never disputed. Why should Mr. Hague trouble himself to prove that which we freely admit? It is for him to show, not that the word *often* means to immerse, but that *it has no other meaning*. Hic labor, hoc opus est.

Before we proceed more directly to point out the insufficiency of Mr. Hague's argument upon this word, we must call attention to certain unfortunate and erroneous statements of facts and authorities. This part of our duty gives us no pleasure; for some of these errors are of so grave and serious a nature, that the mere exposure of them may subject us to the imputation of being unreasonably hard upon our respondent. We charge him with no intentional misrepresentations, and would gladly spare his feelings. But the love of truth, and justice to our cause, will not permit us to shrink from the unpleasant duty before us.

#### MR. HAGUE'S ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS OF FACTS AND AUTHORITIES.

ERROR 1. We adduced the passage, "He shall sprinkle many nations," as proof that the mind of the Ethiopian eunuch had been directed, previous to his baptism, to sprinkling; and hence we inferred a probability that he was sprinkled. To this Mr. Hague replies: "Strange assertion! Here I ask, did not Mr. Towne know, that the version of the Seventy (in which the word *sprinkle* is rendered *astonish*) is the *very one* from which Luke quotes the passage in question? The evangelist himself takes the text of the Seventy word for word!"

Such is Mr. Hague's assertion; and yet the evangelist *does not quote word for word* from the Seventy, but departs from that version in four instances in less than four lines, as will be seen by the note below.\*

ERROR 2. On page 76, he says, that Turretin agrees with him in opinion, as to immersion. Now what is it to agree with Mr. Hague on this subject? It is to maintain that the word has one signification, and one only. But scarcely a writer of equal note, since the days of the apostles, expresses himself more decidedly against this view than Turretin. We will quote the substance of his remarks, and give the reader his own words in a note below.†

“Baptism (says Turretin De Bapt.) is a word of Greek origin, derived from *bapto*, to tinge, to imbue, and from *baptizo*, to dye, to immerse. Plutarch (on Superstition) says, baptize yourself in the sea, that is, plunge yourself in

\* The words in brackets are used by Luke, and not by the Seventy. Ως αμνος εναντιον του χειρονης [αυτου] αφωνος, κυτας ουκ ανοιχεν το στομα [αυτου.] Εν τη ταπεινασει [αυτου] η χρισις αυτου ηρθη την [δε] γεναν.

† *Baptismus vox est origine Græca, quæ a verbo βαπτω deducitur, quod est tingere et imbuere, βαπτιζειν intingere et immergere. Plut. de Supersti., βαπτιζον σε εις θαλασσαν, merge te in mare. Et in vita Thesei recitat versiculum Sybillæ, de Athenis, qui aptus competit Ecclesiæ.*

Ασχυς βαπτιζη, δυναι δε τοι ου θεμις εστι.

*Mergeris uter aquis, sed non submergeris unquam.*

Hinc plus est quam επιολαζειν, quod est leviter innatare, et minus quam δυναιν, quod est pessum ire, id est, ad exitium fundum petere. Quia vero fere aliquid mergi et tingi solet, ut lavetur, et qui immerguntur solent abluī; hinc factum, ut quemadmodum apud Hebræos כַּבַּד quod LXX vertunt βαπτιζα 2 Reg. v. 14, etiam accipiatur pro יָחַד, quod est lavare. Ibid. Ita apud Græcos το βαπτιζειν, per metalepsim, pro eodem usurpetur. Marc. vii. 4. “Judæi non edunt ex foris reduces, nisi lavarint se; εν μη βαπτισωνται.” Nec aliter intelligendæ sunt baptismata calicum, urceorum, et lectorum apud Judeos usitata

the sea; and in his life of Theseus he quotes the Sibylline verse concerning the city of Athens, which more fitly repre-

Et *διαφοροι βαπτισμοι* Judaeis præscripti, de quibus Heb. ix. 10; et supersticiosae lotiones, a traditione veterum acceptæ, de quibus Marc. vii. 4. Unde Pharisei propterea dicti sunt *Baptistai* Justino. Et secta *των ημερω βαπτιστων*, de qua Epiph. haer. 17. Qui quotidianum baptismum urgebant, et contendebant, sic ablutum *απολουεσθαι και αγνιζεσθαι απο πασης αιτιας*. Ex hac vero duplici significatione mergendi et abluendi, duae aliae metaphoricæ deductae sunt. Prior ut baptismus ponatur pro afflictione et calamitate. \* \* \* \* Posterior ut transferatur ad miraculosam donorum Spiritus Sancti effusionem, quia in animam effundi solent ut eam imbuant et abluant, Matt. iii. 11, Act. i. 5, Tit. iii. 5, ex Veteri Testamento, ubi Spiritus communicatio per aquarum effusionem solet adumbrari. Isa. xlv. 3, Joel ii. 28. \* \* \* Ceremoniale est, quod in ritu consistit, nimi ablutio, quae fit per aquam; t Pet. iii. 21, sive per aspersionem, sive per immersionem. \* \* \* Quod (sc. aspersio) institutioni Christi minime repugnat; ita exemplis ecclesiae apostolicae et primitivæ eam secutae confirmari potest. \* \* \*

Ita ubi magna fuit credentium multitudo, ut quum uno die ter mille baptizati sunt, aspersionem potius quam immersionem, quae vix ac ne vix quidem, tam exiguo temporis spatio, commode peragi potuit adhibitam fuisse, dubitari potest. Item quum domatim administrabatur baptismus, ubi probabile non est, semper adfuisse aquae copiam sufficientem ad immersionem; maxime si inopinato res ageretur. Act. xvi. 27, etc. In primitiva ecclesia baptismus clinicorum et aegrotorum dabatur, qui sine dubio per immersionem fieri non potuit. Rationes etiam pro aspersione non desunt variae. 1. Quia vox *βαπτισμου* et verbum *βαπτιζεσθαι*, non tantum de immersione dicitur, sed et de aspersione. Marc. vii. 4. 2. Quia res significata baptismi nomine aspersionis designatur. 3. Quia aspersio sufficit, ad analogiam; nec a quantitate, sed a qualitate aquae pendet vis baptismi. 4. Quia sub. Vet. T. dabantur variae lotiones, et *ραντισμοι*, tam aquae quam sanguinis, ad quas Christus respicit, in institutione baptismi; unde sanguis Christi, qui est res significata, vocatur sanguis *ραντισμου*. 5. Quia aspersio longe commodior est, tum ad prospiciendum sanitati baptisatorum, quæ detrimentum poterat pati ex immersione, in locis frigidioribus, maxime in tenellis infantibus, tum ut parcatur pudori, qui in adultis ex totius corporis nudatione, oriri poterat; cujus causa legimus olim adhibitam fuisse diaconissas, mulieribus nudandis.

sents the church—‘Thou mayest be baptized, O bladder, but it is not permitted to thee to go under the water.’ Hence it means more than lightly to float upon the surface, and less than to be overwhelmed or submerged. But because anything is usually merged and wet, in order that it may be washed, and those who are immersed are generally washed, it happens that the Hebrew word, which the Seventy render *baptize*, 2 Kings v. 15, is equivalent to the word rendered *wash* in the same passage. Likewise with the Greeks *baptize* is used, tropically, to signify washing. (Mark vii. 4.) ‘The Jews, when they come from the market, except they *wash* (baptize) they eat not.’ In the same sense must we understand the washing of cups, pitchers and couches, customary with the Jews; also ‘the divers baptisms’ commanded in the Jewish ritual, and referred to in Heb. ix. 10; and the superstitious washings received by tradition from the elders. On account of these washings, *Justin calls the Pharisees Baptists*. The sect of which Epiphanius speaks, as insisting on being washed every day, expecting thereby to be purified from all sin, was called Every-day-Baptists. From this double *signification of plunging and washing*, two other metaphoric meanings are derived. The first, is that which puts baptism for afflictions. \* \* \* \* The second, is the application of the term to the miraculous effusion of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, because they *are poured out* upon the soul, to imbue and purify it. (Matt. iii. 11, Acts i. 5, Tit. iii. 5.) This manner of speaking is taken from the Old Testament, where the communications of the Spirit are shadowed forth by the pouring out of water. (Isa. xlv. 3, Joel ii. 28.) \* \* \* \* Baptism, viewed as a ceremony, consists in washing, which is done by water, (1 Pet. iii. 21,) *either by sprinkling or immersion*. \* \* \* \* As sprinkling is by no means repugnant to the institution of Christ, so it can be shown by examples that the *apostolic and primitive church practised it*.” [He here very justly distinguishes between the apostolic and the primitive

X Part written by J. W. Miller, 1844

quod est ipsum in se habet in se ipsum  
 System



church.] The examples which he adduces are as follows: "Where there was a great multitude of believers, as when in one day three thousand were baptized, it is hardly possible to doubt that sprinkling was practised, rather than immersion, which could not have been administered in so short a time. Sprinkling too must have been practised when the rite was administered in private houses, where it is highly unreasonable to suppose that water was provided convenient for immersion, particularly in those cases in which they were called to perform the ceremony on sudden and unexpected occasions. In the primitive church, baptism was administered to the sick, on their beds, and *of course* not by immersion."

"The reasons in favor of sprinkling, are,—1. The words baptism and baptize are used to designate not immersion only, but also sprinkling. (Mark vii. 4, Luke xi. 38.) 2. The thing signified by baptism is designated by sprinkling. (1 Pet. i. 2, Heb. x. 22.) 3. Sprinkling answers all the purposes of analogy, the essence of baptism consisting not in the quantity of water, but in the use of that element itself. 4. Under the Old Testament, there were various washings and sprinklings, both of water and blood, and upon these Christ had his eye in the institution of baptism; whence the blood of Christ, which is the thing signified, is called the blood of sprinkling. (Heb. xii. 24.) 5. Sprinkling is far more suitable to health, which is liable to be injured by immersion, in cold climates, especially in the case of tender infants. It also spares the sense of modesty. The ancients felt the difficulty arising from the exposure of the whole naked body, and appointed deaconesses to disrobe the women."

Such is the testimony of the learned and profound Turretin, whom Mr. Hague has summoned upon the stand as a witness against us. When brought into court, and allowed to speak for himself, he not only gives his testimony in our favor; but most eloquently pleads our cause for us. We have quoted him, however, not for the sake of his arguments, but to show what little confidence we can place in Mr. Hague's cita-



tion of authorities. Turretin does not allow that baptizo, the radical word, means to immerse at all, and gives baptizo another signification before that of immerse. He sustains our use of the Sibylline verse.<sup>x</sup> He affirms that the Septuagint and the New Testament writers give the word the meaning of to wash; and says that the Pharisees were called "Baptists" on account of their superstitious washings. He gives the word the *double signification of plunging and washing*. He quotes examples to show that sprinkling was practised by the apostles and primitive Christians, and then argues strongly in favor of sprinkling.

Now Mr. Hague, as an honest man, is bound to thank us for correcting his error. And let him not impute to us (as he did in a similar case, in respect to Ewing, page 82,) the purpose of quoting Turretin *for authority*; and declare his authority worthless, because he does not agree in sentiment with himself. We quote him, not for the value of his authority, *but to expose a misrepresentation.*

ERROR 3. Mr. Hague says, page 76, that Luther asserts immersion to be the only proper mode, as the only one answering to the signification of baptism, and that he so rendered the Greek word in his version of the New Testament. Now this is directly contrary to fact. In Mark vii. 4, Luther translates the word baptize by a word as near our own word wash as the two languages will admit, (waschen.) The word baptism, as applied to pots and couches, &c., in the same verse, he also renders by zu waschen. The same is true of Luke xi. 38. The German word which Luther uses when baptism stands for the religious rite, is not the word which means to immerse, if we may place any reliance upon the two German lexicons now lying upon our table. The word taufen, in Kütner and Nicholson's Lexicon, has only the meanings which appear in the note below.\* Immersion is

\* Taufen—To initiate into the church by the sacrament of baptism. To baptize or christen a child, Jew, or Turk, &c. To give a name. To

not among them. The only meanings given in Weber's German and English dictionary, are,—to baptize, to christen. The same dictionary puts down to the English word immerse, the German words eintauchen, untermachen, versenken, vertiefen. The word taufen, by which Luther renders baptize, does not appear as one of the meanings of immerse, or of either of its synonymes, such as plunge, dip, sink or duck. Now all this is very strange, if that word so plainly means to immerse, *and nothing else*. And it is still more strange that Mr. Hague should have made such an assertion. Whatever may be said of Luther's sentiments as to immersion, his translation of the word baptize is, in all the numerous cases which we have examined, just that which was most consistent with his practice.

ERROR 4. On page 70, Mr. Hague says of Scapula, (whom he praises as "one of the most celebrated lexicographers of Europe,") that he gives to bapto and baptizo the meaning of immerse, (used in regard to those things which, for the sake of dyeing or washing, we wash in water;) likewise to dye, which is done by immersing; and these, together with the application of the word to the Christian rite, he says *are all the meanings* given by Scapula. *But Scapula does give other meanings*. He tells us that the word signifies (*εφαλλος γινεσθαι*) to be upon the sea—to draw up—to fill for drawing up. He also gives examples under the sense of to tinge, (which it is strange Mr. Hague did not see,) to wit, that of painting or staining the hair, and pointing a spear with poison, things not done by immersion.

ERROR 5. Mr. Hague says that "Mr. Towne seems dissatisfied with the moderate statements of Dr. Woods and Professor Stuart, and apologizes for what he calls their concessions arising from their liberality." Now this is a fabrication of Mr. Hague's entire! We neither said nor intimated any such give a name in a solemn manner. To mix with water, to dilute or sophisticate.

thing, in relation to either of those distinguished men. We spoke of them with approbation, and quoted their language as sustaining our views. What reliance can we place on Mr. Hague's citation of authorities, when he quotes from our book what is not to be found in it? We did say, that "some of our writers on the subject, from a desire to show a generous and liberal spirit, have made unwarrantable concessions." The names of Messrs. Stuart and Woods, however, are not mentioned within many pages of this sentence; nor are they here referred to by even the remotest implication. If Mr. Hague has seen fit to *imagine* that we had those gentlemen in our eye, we say that he takes too great liberties. He must not publish his surmises for facts.

ERROR 6. On page 80, Mr. Hague says, "the writer speaks as if the Jews knew nothing of religious immersions;" and then proceeds to tell us, as if he considered us ignorant of the fact, that in legal purifications "the people sometimes dipped themselves." Let the reader turn back to page 9, and he will find that we recognise the fact, of which Mr. Hague so gravely informs us. We there state that "Paul calls the different washings done in the tabernacle service, baptisms, and that among them all there is not an instance of *immersion by the priests*. In all cases where the subjects bathed, there was no *official administration*." Now let the reader decide whether we spoke as if the Jews knew nothing of religious immersions. That Mr. Hague should affirm that our "work betrays startling instances of ignorance or forgetfulness," and follow up that imputation with the above sentence, is some temptation to retort railing for railing. But we forbear. We take occasion to say, however, that when a person was required by the law of Moses to be immersed, the assistance of a priest, or crowd of spectators, was not a part of the ceremony. We challenge Mr. Hague to point out a single instance of immersion by the hands of a priest. *The person bathed himself*. This, both nature and decency seem to ren-

der necessary. And from this fact, which Mr. Hague is very willing that his readers should overlook, we might fairly infer, that the gospel,\* if it had required immersion, would have required each individual to *immerse himself*.

ERROR 7. On page 71, Mr. Hague says, "The principle that baptizo *by its own force* determines the way of applying water, is clearly set forth by those three great lexicographers of the New Testament, Schleusner, Wahl, and Bretschneider." Astonishing! Schleusner defines baptizo, 1. to immerse in water; 2. to wash, sprinkle, or cleanse with water, (ablucio, lavo, aquâ purgo;) 3. to baptize; 4. to pour out largely, (profundo largiter, &c.) Only one of Schleusner's definitions restricts the meaning to immersion. Three of them denote the application of the fluid by affusion. Wahl defines baptizo, first, to wash, to perform ablution, to cleanse. Bretschneider's lexicon gives no ground for Mr. Hague's assertion, for he defines baptizo, to wash, to perform ablution, &c. We have never yet seen a lexicon which sustains Mr. Hague's position. We may well apply to him a remark which Professor Stuart applies to the great champion on his side of the controversy, Mr. Carson. "*Mr. Carson,*" says the professor, "*lays down some very adventurous positions in respect to one meaning, and one only, of words, which, as it seems to me, every lexicon on earth contradicts, and always must contradict.*"

ERROR 8. On page 71, Mr. Hague asserts that Hedericus, Stephanus, Suicer, Passow, and Rost, "declare an entire immersion to belong to the nature of baptism." Of two of these we know nothing. Hedericus (see his lexicon) defines baptizo, immerse, wash, sprinkle. Stephanus defines it, immerse, wash, cleanse. Passow defines it, immerse, wash, sprinkle.

ERROR 9. On page 70, Mr. Hague asserts that there is not a lexicon in the world, which does not give as the primary, the leading meaning under baptizo, to immerse, to sink, to submerge, either two or all of them." This is not true. The lexicon of Flacciolatus and Forcellinus gives the meanings

in the following order: Baptizo, abluo, lavo, i. e. to perform ablution, to wash. The lexicon of Constantius gives the meaning of bapto, the root of baptizo, thus:—Bapto, to tinge, to wash, to color, to immerse, to tinge or tincture with ointment, to imbue, &c. Buck, in his dictionary, says, “*its radical, proper, and primary meaning is, to tinge, to dye, to wet, or the like; which primary design is effected by different modes of application.*” Wahl, in his lexicon, defines it, first, to wash, to perform ablution, to cleanse; secondly, to immerse, &c. This is sufficient to show the incorrectness of Mr. Hague's statement. See Pres. Beecher's Letter, on Lexicons.

ERROR 10. It is stated in our essay, that the word baptize denotes the application of water in divers ways; that all lexicographers concur in this fact, and that no intelligent immerser can deny it. Mr. Hague is an intelligent Immerser, and he denies it. Yet our statement is true; for Mr. Hague's denial is neutralized immediately by his own citations. He appeals to Robinson's lexicon, as one which confines the meaning to immerse, and yet he quotes other meanings. The same is true of others named by him. Mr. Hague seeks indeed to evade the point, by saying that all the other meanings are *figurative*, or *derived*, or come by implication. This will be more fully answered hereafter. It is enough to say here, that other meanings *are other meanings*, come from what source they may. And the denial in that form, though put forth in capitals, is virtually no denial; for our assertion was preceded by a recognition of the principle, that several distinct meanings of a word may be derived from one another.

The reader is now prepared to estimate correctly the validity of Mr. Hague's claim to all the lexicographers. WE SOLEMNLY AVER THAT NO LEXICOGRAPHER WITHIN OUR KNOWLEDGE, IN ANY COUNTRY, AGREES WITH HIM. Does Scapula agree with him? No. Do Flacciolatus and Forcellinus? No. Does Constantius? No. Does Hedericus? No. Does Bretschneider? No. Does Schleusner? No. Does Wahl?



No. Does Stephanus? No. Does Parkhurst? No. Does Ainsworth? No. Does Leigh? No. Does Cole? No. Does Passow? No. Do Suidas? Coulon? Greenfield? No. Does Zonaras? No. Does Gross? No. Does Schrevelius, that great master and critic of the Greek tongue? No. *Carson admits that the lexicographers are against him.* But Mr. Hague does more than simply set his authority in the scale against the authority of lexicographers, the most eminent the world has ever seen. They affirm that baptizo signifies affusion as well as immersion. But Mr. Hague contends that it signifies *only immersion*, and will have it that the lexicographers agree with him! This is wonderful! How shall we account for it? Would Mr. Hague deceive his confiding readers? Impossible. Has he never consulted the lexicographers for himself?—Confessedly there is here something of mystery which we cannot evolve. We must leave the task with our readers.

#### LEARNED CRITICS AND THEOLOGIANS.

With a little swell of language, Mr. Hague repeatedly asserts that all the learning in the world sustains his opinion as to immersion. “The literature of the world,” he says, “is with us.” This is comforting, if true. But our preceding examination of Mr. Hague’s assertions will excite the suspicion, that this also must be taken with some grains of allowance.

We have already seen what kind of support Turretin gave to the immersing principle, when called into court to testify. Perhaps it may be well to summon a few other learned critics and theologians upon the stand, as Mr. Hague has appealed to such authority.

FLACCIOLATUS, in illustrating the meaning of the word, gives an account of certain effeminate priests, at Athens, called Baptai, from *bapto*, to tinge, because like women they tinged, that is, painted their faces. He, of course, found something in the word besides immersion.



Mr. Hague will probably admit, that Vossius was not destitute of some share of the learning of the world. He was one of the most distinguished scholars of the sixteenth century, and professor in two of the seminaries, then the most celebrated. In one place he says, that, "As in the purifications under the law, affusion or sprinkling was sufficient, so in the Christian church, we esteem affusion sufficient for baptism." He says, in another place, "It is clear that the ancient church baptized naked; and there are some who think the custom ought to be observed now, and deny that affusion is baptism. If we discover that the apostles immersed, it does not follow that they always observed this mode. Sometimes they must have baptized by pouring, on account of the multitude, as when they baptized three thousand in one day." He also gives an example of baptism by affusion, by one Laurentius, a martyr. "One of the soldiers," he says, "named Romanus, bringing a cup of water and offering it to him, seized the opportunity to be baptized." This case shows that, in the third century, affusion was so common a mode of baptism, that a soldier could offer himself for it, asking no questions. Vossius also objects to immersion. He quotes another example in which a person, even though baptized naked, was not immersed:—"and when he had stripped off his clothes, he poured water upon his head."\*

WALFRIED STRABO, in his work, De Rebus Eccles., says, "It is to be noticed that many were baptized, and are still baptized, not only by immersion, but by pouring water from above upon them."†

DUNS SCOTUS, Dis. 3. "In baptism the essential part is one thing, to wit, washing or purifying; according to Ephes. v., where the apostle calls baptism the washing of water; and

\* Et cum expoliasset eum, fudit super caput ejus.

† Notandum, non solum mergendo sed etiam de super fundendo multos baptizatos fuisse, et adhuc posse baptizari.

the accidental part another, namely, whether the ablution or purifying be performed by this or that mode.”\*

THOMAS AQUINAS declares, that as the purification of the soul is meant by baptism, it is not essential which way it is done.

CALVIN, in his commentary on Acts, (viii. 38,) after speaking of the former prevalence of the custom of immersing, says—“The custom now prevails, of the minister’s sprinkling water only on the head or body. But so trifling a difference in a ceremony, ought not to be esteemed of such importance as, on account of it, to divide the church, or disturb it with controversy. For the ceremony indeed, AS FAR AS IT HAS BEEN COMMITTED TO US BY CHRIST JESUS, I would rather suffer death than it should be taken from us. But since in the symbol of water we have the testimony both of our purification and of our new life; since in water, as in a glass, Christ shows us his blood, that we may apply it for our purification; since he teaches us to be renewed by his Spirit, that we may be dead to sin and alive to righteousness, it is certain that there is nothing, which belongs to the *substance* of baptism, wanting in the prevailing practice. Hence, *from the beginning, the church allowed itself to differ somewhat as to the form, while sure of retaining the substance.*” Again, he says, “Whether the person baptized be wholly immersed, and whether thrice or not, or whether water be only poured or sprinkled upon him, IS OF NO IMPORTANCE.” Here is a comment on Mr. Hague’s assertion that Calvin agreed with him in opinion, while he differed in practice. “We might well insert a note of admiration here, but we forbear.” Did Calvin think that the command to baptize carried, *of its own force*, the command to immerse? How then could he say, that the *substance* of that command

\* In Baptismo aliquid est de essentia, ut ablutio; juxta illud ad. Eph. v., ubi apostolus baptismum appellat lavacrum aquæ; aliud vero accidentium, nempe ut ablutio hoc vel illo modo fiat.

is realized in sprinkling? How could he affirm that in sprinkling we have the rite as far as it has been committed to us by Christ Jesus? (*Quatenus nobis a Christo tradita est.*) Is Mr. Hague ready to adopt as his own the sentiments and language of this illustrious reformer? Mr. Hague's quotation from Calvin is true; **BUT NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH.** It illustrates admirably our remarks on page 14. Calvin says that baptizo signifies to immerse; but he does not say that it means *nothing but immersion*, nor that immersion is *essential* to Christian baptism, nor that it was *the only mode* practised by the ancient church. Probably Mr. Hague had never read Calvin, and cited him on the authority of some controversialist on his side of the question.

The celebrated WOLF was a man of some learning. But he, in his *Curae Philol.*, does not exactly chime in with Mr. Hague's opinions. In his remarks on the passage—"Go, and teach all nations, baptizing," &c., he says—"Baptizo denotes not only immersion, *but also sprinkling and affusion.*" And again, on Acts viii. he says—"it signifies both to immerse and to tinge; and both forms were practised by the ancient church, which is evident from ancient monuments described by Mabillonius."

ATHANASIUS, as VOSSIUS informs us, did not censure the Arians for sprinkling, but for sprinkling *in the name of the Trinity, when they did not believe it.* His words imply that he considered sprinkling baptism.

With an air of triumph Mr. Hague quotes BEZA, "*the author of the Latin poems,*" as agreeing with him, (page 77.) But if Mr. Hague will adopt Beza's sentiments, there will be no further need of controversy. This writer, after showing that the phrase "in the water" determines nothing, says, "*I have noted this, lest any one should suppose there is any force in this particle, as those seem to persuade themselves, who think that children are not rightly baptized, unless immersed.*" Again, he says, after admitting that baptizo signifies immersion,

“YET BAPTIZO IS TAKEN MORE LARGELY FOR ANY KIND OF WASHING, WHERE THERE IS NO DIPPING AT ALL.” Here you see disclosed the true sentiments of Beza. And yet Mr. Hague and the Watchman are proclaiming to the world that Beza was a close communion immerser! We are almost tempted to exclaim, O shame! where is thy blush? But it is said, “Beza says that baptizo signifies immersion.” So do Messrs. Towne and Cooke. But does Beza say that it means *nothing but immersion*? Does Beza say that immersion is *essential* to the rite? Does Beza say that *none are rightly baptized*, unless they are immersed? That he never intended to be so understood, is evident from the above quotations from his writings.

Zanchius, the intimate friend of the famous Peter Martyr, was a celebrated scholar, and at one time read lectures both in divinity and in the Aristotelian philosophy in the seminary at Strasburg. He says, “Baptizo *doth as well signify* to dye, and simply to sprinkle, as to immerse.”—Cultu Dei. Lib 1. Chap. 16.

Paræus says, “Baptism, with the Greeks, imports any washing or cleansing, whether it be done by dipping or sprinkling.” Paræus was an eminent scholar of the sixteenth century, and made by prince Casimir a professor at Heidelberg. In 1589 he published the German Bible, with notes.

Musculus was a distinguished scholar of the sixteenth century. In 1549 he was settled as professor of theology at Bern. *He also wrote Latin poetry*, and left many valuable commentaries on the Scriptures. Musculus says, “It is free for the church to baptize either by dipping or sprinkling.”—Wall’s Hist.

Lynwood says, “Dipping is not to be accounted of the essence of baptism, but it may be given also by pouring or sprinkling.”—Do.

Treractius says, “Baptism, according to the etymology of it, signifies commonly any kind of ablution or cleansing.”—Lib. 2. de Baptismo.

Tilenus says, "If we regard the etymology of the word baptism, it signifies dipping and also sprinkling."—Disput. de Baptismo, p. 883.

Let us next hear a few additional words from LUTHER, who seems to be a favorite with Mr. Hague. In his homilies on baptism, which were not written with any reference to the mode, Luther throws out here and there a casual expression, which gives a clue to his opinions. In the passage—"He that believeth and is *baptized*," &c., he uses *tingo*, a word employed frequently to designate simply to wet. He says, "It must be known and believed that it (that is, the water of baptism) is such that by it we are purified and cleansed, and receive what the Scripture calls the washing of regeneration." This is not the style of speech common with Immersers. Again, he thus speaks of baptism:—"Concerning this ablution and cleansing from sin, David says—'Wash me from iniquities, and cleanse me from my sin. Sprinkle me with hyssop, and I shall be clean.' And the prophet—'I will sprinkle clean water,' &c." It will be perceived that Luther is here showing, that the true end of baptism is not accomplished, except the soul is cleansed from sin; but the costume of the external rite is evidently alluded to. In another paragraph, preserving the same connection between the sign and the thing signified, he says, "Baptism is nothing else than to be washed and cleansed in the red and precious blood of Christ. Hence Peter says of those baptized, *that they were sprinkled by the blood of Christ*." (1 Pet. i. 2.) In his annotations, Luther calls the legal washings, commanded by Moses, *various baptisms*. In view of these quotations, the reader will see with what truth it is claimed, that Luther found in the word baptize the necessary and exclusive meaning of immersion.

ERASMUS ranks among the first scholars of modern times. He calls *the sprinkling* of the blood of Christ *baptism*.

JEROME says, "The Lord Jesus declares, I have also another



*baptism* to be *baptized* with. You *baptize* me with water, that I may *baptize* you, as a witness for me, *with your own blood.*" This was incidentally said, and it shows that Jerome found something besides immersion in the word *baptism*. The martyr surely was not *immersed* in his own blood. And yet Jerome calls *the shedding* of one's blood in martyrdom a *baptism*. There are no limits, however, to some men's ingenuity. Since Mr. Hague has contrived to *immerse a lake* in the *blood of a mouse*, he may attempt (and with equal success!) to make out a case of immersion here.

In MARTYROLOGIO ADONIS, ad. 3. Cid. Majus, we read, "Whom the blessed Callistus, after enjoining fasting, catechised, *brought water* and baptized, (allatâ aquâ baptizabit.) Here the water *was brought*—of course not *for immersion*. But nevertheless it was brought for *baptism*.

BASSILIUS, speaking of the forty martyrs, says—"They were *baptized*, not with water, but with their own blood."\* They were not *immersed* in their own blood, and yet they were *baptized* with it.

PETER MARTYR, the celebrated reformer and theologian of the sixteenth century, at different times professor of divinity at Strasburg, Oxford, and Zurich, thus gives his testimony:—"Baptizo signifies not only to dip, but *in any way to tinge or wet.*"

ALSTEDIUS, another eminent scholar of the sixteenth century, professor of philosophy and theology, at Hesborn, in Nassau, and afterwards at Wettemberg, in Transylvania, says, "The term *baptism* signifies *both immersion and sprinkling*, and of consequence ablution." And so say Wolledius, Doederlein, Danaeus, Ursinus, Lightfoot, Wickliffe, Vorri-long, Bonaventure, Mاسترict, Kecherman, and a host of others.

Mr. Hague will not dispute the authority of TERTULLIAN,

\* Εβαπτισθη ουκ εν υδατι αλλεν το ιδιο αιματι.



who lived within one hundred years of the apostles. This vénéralé father says, "that baptizo means not only to immerse, but also to pour." (Mergere non tantum, sed et perfundere.)

Will Mr. Hague pretend that the most learned theologians and biblical critics of our own country are with him? DR. DWIGHT says that "the *primary* meaning of the word baptizo is *cleansing*." BARNES says, "Baptizo signified *originally* to tinge, to dye, to stain." PROFESSOR STUART, after stating that he could see no evidence that immersion was exclusively the mode of Christian baptism, affirms that "if any one maintains the contrary, it must be either BECAUSE HE IS UNABLE RIGHTLY TO ESTIMATE THE NATURE OR POWER OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE; or because he is influenced in some measure by party feeling; or else because he has looked at the subject in only a partial manner, without examining it fully and thoroughly."

In view of these facts, in what light appears Mr. Hague's turgid boast, that all the learning of the world sustains his side of the controversy? He is confounded by his own witnesses. What is the testimony of Wolf? Calvin? Athanasius? Beza? Zanchius? Vossius? Paræus? Musculus? Lynwood? Trelactius? Tilenus? Erasmus? Jerome? Bassilius? Peter Martyr? Alstedius? Tertullian? Wolladius? Doederlein? Lightfoot? Danaeus? Ursinus? Wickliffe? Bonaventure? Kecherman? Vorrilong? Mastricht? Thomas Aquinas? Wall? Leigh? Lombard? Morus? Whitaker? Maldonet? Piscator? Walker? Pool?—but we forbear. Time would fail us to allude even by name to the numerous Greek scholars and biblical critics, in Europe and our own country, who give no countenance whatever to Mr. Hague's principles. Their united voice is against him. They may admit, indeed, that immersion is one meaning of the Greek word. But never do they contend *for this meaning exclusively*. Never do they maintain that *without an immersion there is no baptism*. These illustrious men

are made to support such principles—how? *By keeping back a part of the truth*, as in the case of Ewing, page 14. We venture to affirm that, in almost every instance, where a critic of any notoriety is cited by the advocates for immersion, he would serve them no purpose, *if permitted to utter his entire sentiments*.

There is one expedient adopted by Mr. Hague, in order to bring the learned on his side, which, if not original with him, is at least quite amusing. Apprehending some difficulty from the well-known fact that the great body of the learned of the present day practise sprinkling, and fearing that this might lead his readers to suspect the correctness of his statement, he ventures the presumptuous assertion, that, if they do not agree with him in *practice*, they do agree with him in *sentiment*. What! do Christian scholars universally believe *immersion essential to the very nature of baptism*, and yet practise sprinkling? This is a sweeping charge of insincerity. That they so generally *practise sprinkling* is, to our minds, satisfactory proof that they do not consider immersion positively enjoined by the command of our Lord to baptize. Mr. Hague's assertion implies that they are acting hypocritically.

We have now destroyed the whole force of Mr. Hague's Reply, and might lay aside our pen. But as we commenced with a purpose to leave no suggestion of his unanswered, we shall proceed briefly to notice his

#### PRINCIPLES OF PHILOLOGY.

The grand principle of Mr. Hague's philology seems to be this—that *if all the various meanings of a word can be traced, by any relation, however fanciful, to any one of those meanings, that one embraces the whole in itself*. Such a principle, if admitted, would lead directly to the conclusion, that no word in the language has more than one meaning. In his remarks on the several definitions given to the word baptizo in Robinson's Lexicon, Mr. Hague says—"That abbreviated word,

*denoting by implication*, is very important in this case, and involves the principle which Mr. Towne has overlooked, and by overlooking it, he misunderstands the lexicons." It seems, then, that we have not yet learned to read the lexicons, because we see not how to trace all the meanings, which branch off by implication, to one meaning, and make the whole family of significations attached to each word but one meaning. Upon this principle the whole controversy is in fact made to turn. Mr. Hague assumes it as a just principle of philology, and bases his reasoning upon it. Let us test this principle by some English word.

Take, for example, the word *SPRING*. The first meaning which occurs, is a leap or jump. Then others follow—as, elastic power—an elastic body—motives—a fountain of water—a season of the year—a crack in a mast—the source of a thing. Let the reader now see if he cannot trace these various significations back to the first, to wit, a leap or jump. The idea of elastic power comes from the first by *implication*, because one jumps by means of elastic power; and so with the rest. Now if Mr. Hague should say that a crack in a mast is the same by "*implication*" with motives of conduct, or a fountain of water the same with the spring of a watch, he would only be carrying out that favorite principle of philology, which he complains that we overlook. He might just as well say that *spring*, when used to designate a part of a watch, means the same as when used to designate a fountain of water, as to say that baptize, when used of *lathering one's face*, means the same as when used of *bathing in the sea*. These surely are different actions, expressed by the same word. Let the reader apply Mr. Hague's principle of one meaning to the following sentence:—In the *spring* of 1840, a man by the name of *Spring*, made a *spring* over a ditch, and fell into a *spring* on the opposite side, and broke the *spring* of his watch.

Permit us to remind Mr. Hague that *secondary meanings*

shoot forth from the primary signification of almost all words ; a grand characteristic of language which he seems wholly to overlook. They proceed generally from cause to effect ; and it not unfrequently happens that the primary meaning is merged or lost in some remote secondary. For the sake of illustration, let us suppose that baptizo signified originally to immerse. As *washing* is sometimes *the effect* of immersing, the word might easily pass from its first specific signification, to denote simply the *effect* ; and in process of time wholly displace the specific meaning. On the same principle, it might come to mean *to dye*, and *to tinge*, without retaining the idea of immersion. As *purification* is an effect of *washing*, this meaning might engraft itself upon *washing*, and express at last the whole force of the word : so that to baptize and to purify would be equivalent terms. This meaning the word might very naturally assume in standing for a religious rite, the main design of which was to symbolize the *purification of the soul*. If such is the nature of language, an attempt to chain words to one meaning is fruitless ; and to contend for the primary idea, in all the subsequent usages, is ridiculous.

Mr. Hague says, that baptizo must determine the meaning by its own force, or there is no clue to the author's meaning. If Mr. Hague says this of some *fragment* of a sentence, we reply that it *does not* determine the sense by its own force, and there is no clue to the author's meaning. The example which he himself cites (*βλπτεται η ναυς*) is admirably in point. He says that the lexicons agree in saying, that this means, the ship sinks. But would he have known it, if the lexicons had not said it ? And could the lexicographers have discovered it, if they had not seen the word in connection with other words ? That they could not, is clear ;—for those same lexicographers tell us that the word sometimes means simply (*εφαλος γινεσθαι*) to be on the sea. The *word itself* does not forbid our translating the phrase, the ship is washed with the

waves, or the ship is launched, &c. The *two words alone* furnish no clue to the author's meaning. We will give another example, as το σωμα αυτου εβαφθη. Will Mr. Hague tell us the precise meaning of the Greek verb here? Will he give us the *author's* meaning? According to his own principles, he should be able to do it; and should at once pronounce the meaning to be this—*his body was immersed or drowned*. But this is very far from being the *author's* meaning, as any one may see by turning to Dan. v. 21, where the whole passage reads thus: "and his body (Nebuchadnezzar's) was wet or sprinkled *with the dew* of heaven." There were certain idolatrous priests at Athens, called ΒΑΡΤΑΙ, from βαπτω. Why was this name given them? Mr. Hague must necessarily say, that they were so called because they had been *immersed*, or were *immersers*. But was this the fact? We will answer this question hereafter. We see, therefore, that there may be sentences, or a fragment of a sentence, as for instance that quoted by Mr. Hague, in which the word *by its own force* does not give the *author's* meaning. This fact proves that it has more than one specific meaning.

But if Mr. Hague intended to say this of every complete sentence where this word occurs, it is an easy task to show his mistake. If his assertion is true of baptizo, it is true of all other important words. The principle of philology, then, involved in his assertion is this, *that words must determine their sense BY THEIR OWN FORCE, or there is no clue to the author's meaning*. Let us bring this principle to the test. Take the English word *bar*, which means a rail thrown across a passage—an enclosure in a tavern—any obstruction—an enclosure in a court—an association of lawyers—a line in music, &c. All these meanings attach to the word. Now read the following line, and say whether the word determines the sense by its own force:

"Must I new *bars* to my own joys create?"

Here we cannot determine, by the simple force of the word,



whether bars mean tavern bars, or the enclosure in a court, or the rails of a fence, or any obstruction, or a line of music, or a company of lawyers. *And yet there is no difficulty in getting at the author's meaning.* Mr. Hague complains that our principles of philology "turn order into confusion." But if he can have no order in language, till each word has only one *specific* meaning, expressing by its own force a definite proposition, he will not see the chaos of speech reduced to order in his day.

MR. HAGUE'S UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPT TO EXPLAIN AWAY  
OUR CITATIONS FROM THE CLASSICS.

In order to maintain his position, Mr. Hague must needs explain away our examples. Out of the eleven cases cited by us, he has selected four, in which he thinks he discovers immersion. Suppose we grant what he affirms of these four, there still remain seven, for whose immersion he makes no provision. From the course which he has adopted, we are left to infer, that he thought it best to select those examples the most susceptible of a plausible evasion, expecting that the reader would lose sight of the rest, in the dust raised by his criticism. We ask the reader, therefore, to run his eye again over those examples in which the inventive fancy of Mr. Hague cannot find even a figurative immersion. They are such as the following: "the face lathered (baptized) with tawny rushes"—"a garment stained (baptized) with blood drawn by a sword"—"the hand wet (baptized) by pressing a substance," &c. &c. Out of eleven cases, seven have passed unscathed.

We now turn to the less fortunate examples.

"To-day, ye bearers of water, draw up (baptize) none." Mr. Hague might have spared his ridicule here, since we share it in the good company of his favorite Scapula. Scapula says that this word is used for—to draw up, and to fill for



drawing up. Mr. Hague confines it to the last of the two senses, and says it cannot have the first meaning. We leave him to settle the point with his venerated Scapula, reminding him, at the same time, that Hesychius and several other lexicographers concur with Scapula.

The next case is the following:—"When it *drops* upon the garments, they are dyed," (baptized.) Mr. Hague labors hard to find immersion here. But the garments are dyed,—how? By what process? By dipping? No. Mr. CARSON, one of the most learned and able writers on Mr. Hague's side of the question, generously gives up this example. Hippocrates employs the word, he says, "to denote dying by *dropping* the dying liquid on the thing dyed. It is surely not dying by dipping." The reader will judge, whether *dropping* is *dipping*, or whether the idea of *dipping* is to be found in a process of dying by *dropping*! This case is itself sufficient to overthrow Mr. Hague's main position. He says that the word *baptism* denotes an action, and that action *must necessarily* be dipping. He affirms that *immersion* and *baptism* are equivalent terms; and that the Englishman might as well speak of an *immersion* by sprinkling, as the Greek of a *baptism* by sprinkling. But Hippocrates spoils all this; for he uses *baptism* to denote a mode of action, which he informs us was dropping. This proves that Mr. Hague has yet to learn the true import of the word. The English scholar could never speak of an *immersion* by sprinkling; nor could the Greek have spoken of a *baptism* by sprinkling or dropping, if Mr. Hague's views of that word were correct. That Hippocrates does call a mode of coloring by the *dropping* of the liquid *baptism*, is conclusive proof that Mr. Hague does not understand the word. He would give it limits which it spurns.

The next example is that of "the lake baptized with the blood of a mouse." We have already introduced Mr. CAR-

son to the reader. Surely his authority will not be disputed. "To suppose that there is here any allusion to the literal immersion or dipping of a lake, says Mr. Carson, is a monstrous perversion of taste. The lake is said to be *dyled*, not to be *dipped*, or poured, or sprinkled. *There is in the word no reference to the mode.* What a monstrous paradox in rhetoric is the figure of the dipping of a lake in the blood of a mouse! Never was there such a figure. The lake is not said to be dipped in blood, but to be *dyled with blood.*"—Beecher, Art. Bib. R., Jan. 1840. (We have no partiality for the entomological tribe to which Mr. Hague refers, (see p. 73,) and no inclination to share the benefits of their attentions with him and the playful student.)—The reader will observe that Mr. Carson concedes this example. He allows that the word is used here to denote an effect, without reference to the mode by which it is produced. But if it may be so used here, *why not in other places?* If Mr. Hague's views respecting the word were correct, it could not be used *in a single instance* as Homer here uses it.

The next case is that of the Sibylline verse. We presume Mr. Hague will not stake his reputation as a scholar on the assertion, that *δύωαι*, by its own force, means to drown. Yet he quotes with approbation a loose translation, in which such a sense is given. He says, "this is poetry, and good sense." All that may be, and yet not be the meaning of the passage in question. The other rendering, he says, is nonsense. But is it nonsense to speak of Athens as *too buoyant* to sink?

Now let the reader judge, whether Mr. Hague has successfully explained away our examples from the classics. Seven remain wholly unscathed. Two of the four which he attempts to wrest from us, his own friend acknowledges to be fairly ours. For the other two we feel no anxiety.

We sought in our essay to make the subject under discus-

sion perfectly intelligible to the English reader; and therefore avoided as much as possible the costume of the schools, and quotations from foreign languages. At the same time, we designed to base our reasonings on sound philological principles. Aware that the advocates for immersion contend that the word baptize has but one meaning, and that they rely chiefly upon its pagan use, we concluded to give the reader a few quotations from pagan writers, showing that, even among them, it designated *different modes* of applying a liquid. We might have added others. The sense of *to dye* is very extensively given to βαπτω. Compounded with other words, it denotes a dyer, a dye-house, a dying-vat, &c. As a compound, it is used in the sense of *gilding*, or coloring with gold. The priests at Athens, called ΒΑΡΤΑΙ, “were so called from βαπτω, to tinge or paint, because, like women, they tinged their faces with paint.” In Arrian—Expedition of Alexander:—Τους δε πρωγωνας λεγει Νεαρχος οτι βαπτωνται Ινδοι: “Nearchus relates that the Indians dye their beards.” Mr. Carson admits that they did not *dye* their beards by immersion.—Bib. R., Jan. 1840. Although the reader has before him sufficient proof, that the word is capable of denoting more than one mode of applying a liquid, we request him to peruse carefully the following

LETTER FROM EDWARD BEECHER, D. D., PRESIDENT OF ILLINOIS COLLEGE, JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS.

REV. JOS. H. TOWNE.

Dear Brother,—With your request that I would notice the remarks of Mr. Hague on myself, and also that I would furnish you with certain facts and authorities, of which I spoke I cheerfully comply.

The design of Mr. Hague's remarks on me is, to produce the belief that I have been inexcusably inaccurate in the state-

ment of plain scripture facts, through ignorance or forgetfulness. His words are,—“This is something like a statement which President Beecher, of Illinois, has ventured to make on the same subject. He says, ‘Nor is the washing of the clothes, so often spoken of, enjoined by a word denoting immersion.’ Now for the refutation of this, just turn to Numbers xxxi. 21, 23. ‘This is the ordinance of the law which the Lord commanded Moses. Every thing that may abide the fire ye shall make it go through the fire, and it shall be clean; nevertheless it shall be purified with the water of separation; and all that abideth not the fire, ye shall make *go through the water.*’ Now this passage has been in the Bible ever since these writers were boys, and how is it, that, to all intents and purposes, they never saw it?”

To his concluding question I reply, that, to all intents and purposes, I had seen and thoroughly examined it, before I made the assertion, which he has ventured to controvert; and of my position it contains no refutation at all:—for,

1. It does not contain the command to wash the clothes to which I refer;—and,

2. If it did, it contains no word denoting immersion.

3. The command, to which I did refer, occurs in the very next verse, and fully sustains my assertion; and yet this Mr. Hague did not *venture* to quote.

1. The passage refers to the purification of the spoils taken from an enemy. It does not relate to “the washing of the clothes so often spoken of.” This was the washing of a person’s own clothes. Moreover, it is not a specific command to wash clothes at all, but a general command to cause that to pass through the water which will not stand the fire. If he says this includes clothes, I reply, it just as much includes books and parchment, for they will not stand the fire; and will Mr. Hague therefore call it a command to wash books and parchment, &c.?

The plain fact is, it is not a specific command to wash anything by name; and yet I was speaking of a specific command to wash clothes by name, and nothing else. Again, this command is not one oft repeated—it occurs nowhere else. The washing of the clothes to which I refer, I characterized as “often spoken of.” How, then, does this passage refute my assertion? It does not even touch it. Again, if it were the command to wash clothes to which I refer, yet still it contains no word denoting immersion. Does the word עָבַר, to pass, to go, denote immersion? Does its Hiphil form, to cause to pass, denote immersion? Mr. Hague may reply, that *the phrase* to cause to pass *through water* denotes immersion. Very well, so it does; and when I ever deny it, then let him quote this passage against me. But I have done no such thing. I spoke of *a word* in which an oft-repeated injunction is given, and mentioned the identical word, viz., כָּבַס, and affirmed that it did not denote immersion. And is it a refutation of this, to adduce a complex phrase, implying immersion merely by an adjunct, but in which the leading verb does not mean to immerse at all, but only to pass? If we say that a bird passes *through the air*, it implies flying, by force of an adjunct; does the word *to pass* therefore mean *to fly*?

But why did Mr. Hague omit the command to wash their own clothes, which occurs in the next verse? Here would have been a case in point. It is a specific command to wash clothes, and not a general command to purify spoils. It is an instance of the command to which I referred as oft repeated, and it contains the word specified. And will Mr. Hague venture to deny the truth of my assertion concerning it? After all, it seems to me that the *venturing* is on his side, not on mine. He has ventured to assail a plain truth, which no man can disprove or reasonably deny.

Of the authorities and facts to which I referred, there are many besides those which I have already adduced in my arti-



cles on baptism, and which I propose to employ in my concluding article. But, at your request, I will adduce at this time a few.

A passage in CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA deserves particular notice, as settling beyond dispute the position that those to whom the Greek was vernacular did regard βαπτίζω as signifying to purify, *irrespective of mode*. It occurs Strom., book 4, p. 531 : Paris, 1641. Speaking of the true gnostic, i. e., one who has the true knowledge of God, he is led to speak of purity as essential in order to see God ; and this leads, by a natural transition, to the *rites* denoting purification. He then remarks, that an idea of such modes of purification may have proceeded from Moses to the heathen poets, thus—Και δι και η εικων του βαπτισματος ειη αν και η εκ Μωϋσεως παραδεδομενη ταις ποιηταις ωδε πως.

Η δ υδρηναμενη καθαρα χερῶν ἔματ' εχουσα  
 Η Πηνελοπη επι την ευχην ερχεται Τηλεμαχος δε  
 Χειρας νιψαμενος πολικης ἄλος ευχετ' Αθηνη.

Εθος τουτου Ιουδαιων, ως και το πολλαις επι κοιτη βαπτιζεσθαι. He here states, that that may be an image or resemblance of baptism, which has been handed down from Moses to the poets. He then illustrates it by two instances :—Penelope washed herself and put on clean apparel, and went to her devotions. Telemachus washed his hands in the ocean, and prayed to Minerva. He then adds, this was the custom of the Jews, that they should BE OFTEN BAPTIZED UPON THEIR COUCHES. To denote washing, Homer uses ιδρανω ; to denote washing the hands, νιπτω. Here I propose to any intelligent and candid Greek scholar the following inquiries :—

1. Is not ιδρανω a generic word to denote washing or purification ? Is it not as generic as καθαριζω ?
2. Dare any one say that νιπτω denotes immersion ? Is washing of the hands immersion ?

*The term is not strictly but used of baptism*



3. In *these instances* Clement says there is an *image* or resemblance of baptism. Of *purification* there is an image; but what *image* or resemblance is there of *immersion*?

4. Our credulity has been sorely taxed by the demand to believe, that *couches* were habitually immersed by the Jews; yes, by all the Jews;—shall we go one step farther, and affirm that it was their custom frequently to *be immersed upon their couches*? shall we believe that they had baptisteries below their couches, and an apparatus of ropes and pullies, for elevating and depressing men, couches, and all? and that they were in the habit of doing this *frequently* in the course of *one meal*?

5. What then does the passage mean? Plainly, that they reclined on their couches, and often *washed their hands* during their meals. This is a matter of history and of fact. The other interpretation is ridiculous and absurd. Now the washing of the hands is *a purification*. The Psalmist says, I will wash my hands in innocency. Pilate desired to declare his freedom from guilt by washing his hands before the multitude. But the washing of hands is no immersion. The conclusion is inevitable that βαπτίζω here denotes *to purify*, not to *immerse*.

I will now state the general fact that both the Latin and Greek fathers, under the words βαπτισμοι and βαπτισματα, do include not only the washing of the body and hands *in any way*, but also the *sprinklings* and *expiations*, not only of the Mosaic ritual, but OF THE WHOLE HEATHEN WORLD. Of this in my next article I shall give ample proof; there is not room for it in detail here. I will only add, as to βαπτίζω, a single passage from JUSTIN MARTYR, relating to spiritual purification.

“What is the benefit,” says he, “of that baptism which cleanses the flesh and the flesh alone? Βαπτισθητε την ψυχην απο της σαρξης και απο πλεονεξιας απο φθονου, απο μισους και ιδου το σωμα καθαρον εστιν.”

Translate this—be *purified* as to your soul from wrath, covetousness, envy, and hatred, and Lo your body is pure—and all see the sense and feel its beauty. But who, that was not violently pressed to support a theory, would ever venture to use the barbarous expression, be *immersed as to your soul* from wrath, &c., and Lo your body is pure?

I will add two instances of the use of βαπτω. In book 4, lines 156, 157, of the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, occurs the most remarkable case of immersion or dipping on record, if it is true that βαπτω always means to dip. The *subject* of the immersion was the HUGE DRAGON who guarded the golden fleece; the immerser, Medea; and that into which the dragon was immersed, *a juniper branch*. The facts of the case are these:—As Medea and Jason approach, the HUGE SERPENT raises himself up in vast coils, rising like volumes of smoke above volumes of smoke in some vast conflagration. Medea then sings her incantations, and relaxes his sinews; he throws himself forward and extends himself in huge folds—with uplifted head seeking to devour them. Medea then resorts to a soporific mixture in a cup, or goblet, and, in the words of the poet,

Ἡ δὲ μιν ἀρκευθοιο γενν τετμεοτι θαλλῶ  
 Βαπτους' ἐκ κυκωνος ἀκνρατα φαρμακ' αοιδαῖς  
 'Ραινε κατ' οφθαλμων.

That is, (*if βαπτω means dip, or immerse,*) she, immersing him, with or in a newly cut juniper bough, sprinkled strong soporific poisons with songs upon his eyes; and thus put him to sleep. Here I inquire—Did Medea, according to the poet, *take up this* HUGE SERPENT? This was plainly necessary to dip or immerse him. How could she dip or immerse him *in a cup*, or *in a juniper bough*, or *with it*? If she did immerse him, it must have been done by sprinkling, for the poet expressly asserts that she *sprinkled* her soporific poisons on him. Will our immersing brethren then admit, that

we can immerse by sprinkling, from a cup, with a branch? If so, then all controversy is at an end; for we are all willing to immerse by sprinkling.

Now in this case the facts are undeniable. The subject was a VAST SERPENT. Medea took a bough of juniper, and sprinkled him with it, from a soporific mixture, in a cup. To describe this operation, the poet uses βαπτω and ραινω. If this is immersion, all will admit that it is the most remarkable case on record; and performed in the most remarkable way.

But the Greek scholiast sees no immersion here. His words are—εν τούτοις και τοις εφεξής φησι την Μεδειαν επιρραίνουσαν αρχευθω το φαρμακον κοιμισται τον δρακοντα; that is, in these and the following words the poet says, that Medea, *sprinkling* the poison, with the juniper branch, put the dragon to sleep. And the editor illustrates it by a reference to the passage in Virgil, in which the god of sleep shakes a bough, moistened with Lethean water, over the temples of Palinurus, and puts him to sleep.

The second case is from Lucien. Speaking of dying purple, with the shell-fish called πορφυρα, he says, δυναται γαρ βαπτειν ουκ εσθισθαι μονον το της πορφυρας κρεας. That is, (if βαπτω means to immerse or dip,) the *flesh* of the shell-fish can not only be eaten, but can also dip or immerse!! Dip or immerse what? and how can *flesh* dip or immerse anything? Translate it "can not only be eaten, but also color or dye," and all is plain.

As to LEXICONS—I have examined with care five made by writers of the Greek language, in which their *definitions are in Greek*—I refer to Suidas, Hesychius, Zonaras, Phavorinus, and the Etymologicum Gudianum, and in NONE OF THEM IS THE SENSE IMMERSE GIVEN EITHER TO βαπτω OR βαπτιζω. Zonaras gives full definitions of the ecclesiastical usage of βαπτιζω, all of which sustain the position that it denotes sacrificial purification, i. e., the remission of sins; yea, he

expressly so defines it—*ἡφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν δι' ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος*—the forgiveness of sins by water and the Spirit; and what is this but sacrificial purification, or *καθαρισμός*? And Phavorinus follows him exactly in this.

I have now only to ask—what is the highest authority on this subject, the opinions of modern critics, or of those *who spoke and wrote the Greek as their vernacular tongue*?

Our immersing brethren are fond of claiming “all the learning of modern Europe” as on their side. I do not admit the truth of their claim. But if I did, I would only reply, Before their tribunal I refuse to stand. I appeal from them to those whose decision must be final—THE ORIGINAL WRITERS OF THE GREEK TONGUE.

And, as a friend, I would advise our immersing brethren to cease from using the oft-repeated thunder of great names, and to appeal directly to the writings of the Greek fathers, and other writers of ecclesiastical Greek. I, for one, am perfectly willing to abide the result.

I am yours affectionately,

E. BEECHER.

Clemens Alexandrinus, to whom Pres. Beecher refers, was one of the fathers of the church, distinguished for learning and eloquence. He was born A. D. 217. The examples cited in the above letter are decisive. We call the attention of Mr. Hague to them particularly. Will he inform us, and the public generally, in what manner Medea *immersed* the dragon with a juniper bough? This he must do, or abandon his position. Here is a clear case of *a baptism* by sprinkling. With this example before him, will Mr. Hague presume to say that *bapto* admits of but one mode of applying a liquid? As well might he contend that our English word *travel* specifies but *one mode* of going from place to place; or that our word *wash* specifies but *one mode* of using water. And let it be distinctly understood, that to multiply instances where the word denotes

an immersion can avail Mr. Hague nothing. What if we should give the reader ten thousand examples in which our word wash is used of an immersion—would all this prove that it cannot signify *other modes* of using water? The examples already adduced, prove beyond all doubt that *baptize* has not the determinate meaning of immerse.

#### EXAMPLES FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT AND APOCRYPHAL WRITERS.

Our citations from the Old Testament and the apocryphal writers bring us to the same conclusion. See page 9. These examples Mr. Hague has passed over without notice. He has preferred to fill his space with certain fanciful illustrations and unsupposable suppositions. The case of the officer is not worthy of a serious answer. No *man* could ever suppose that orders to sail to Nova Scotia required him to move through the air like *a bird*, or a kite, or the moon. There is but one mode of sailing common among men. Mr. Hague's illustration, therefore, is not in point. We will furnish our reader with one more to the purpose. Suppose an individual to receive orders to *travel* to Nova Scotia. He goes to his books to learn what *to travel means*, and finds that to travel signifies to walk, to ride on horseback, to sail in a steamboat, to ride in a rail-car, &c. What then? Is he perplexed? Is he in doubt what to do? By no means. He sees that the command is of such a nature that it may be obeyed *in divers ways*. It commands him *to go* to the place specified, but determines nothing as to the *mode* of travelling. An individual is commanded to wash. Now because there are divers ways of washing, and no one way is specified, is the command unintelligible? Certainly not. All which he is required to do, is simply to wash, the *mode* of washing *not being essential to obedience*. And if the word baptize, in its application to the Christian rite, is used in the generic sense of cleansing or purifying, there is no difficulty in discovering what is essen-



tial to a due observance of it, although no one mode of cleansing is specified. The very fact that no one mode is specified, only proves that the *essence* of the rite consists in *the use of clean water*, and not in the *mode* of using it.

But to test still further Mr. Hague's principle of holding sacred words to one sense only, and that the classic, let us take the word *πνευμα*. Its first meaning is *wind*—and then others, such as breath, the soul, the temper of the mind, and the Spirit of God, all come, by implication or analogy, from the primary meaning. If Mr. Hague will treat this word as he does baptize, and insist upon the primary classic signification, he will give us some ludicrous specimens of philology. He must then interpret the phrase, "he gave up the ghost," *he gave up the wind*. "The poor in spirit" must then be *poor in wind*. "In spirit and in truth," according to Mr. Hague, is *in wind and in truth*. "Paul determined in his mind" must read—*Paul determined in his wind*. "The spirit of meekness" we must understand as the *wind* of meekness. Who will tell us in what particulars this fails of being a fair carrying out of Mr. Hague's main principle of philology—the principle on which the whole matter in dispute turns?

Mr. Hague defies us *to cope with Universalists* on our principles, and goes on to tell us what absurd things they say about the word *αιωνικον*, as though we were answerable for their perversions. But has he seen no successful arguments against Universalists by Pedobaptist writers? And yet, let us ask, did he ever see one that adopted his theory of *one meaning and one only*? We have never heard Professor Stuart's argument on the meaning of *αιων* ever objected to by Immersers, on the ground that he classifies *the different meanings* of the word. And did Mr. Hague ever try his principle of *one meaning and one only*, in a discussion with Universalists? The very point for which the Universalists contend respecting the word *γεεννα* (hell) is this,—that it is used in its *primary sense of the Valley of Hinnom*. Grant them



this, and their proof that there is no hell, (so far as this word is concerned,) is complete. Yes, and Mr. Hague should have reflected, that the very word *αιων*, (age,) which he selects, if interpreted by his principle of strictly adhering to what is called the primary meaning, and making that alone *the* meaning, would be yielding the point entire to Universalists, so far as *that* word is concerned. Indeed, what he wishes us to do with baptizo, is just the thing which Universalists do with every word in dispute between them and us. His reference to Universalists was, therefore, very unfortunate for him.

But to return from this digression to the matters which he has passed over. We quoted examples of the use of the word in the Old Testament, and in the Apocrypha, in which baptize is used in a sense different from that of immerse. These Mr. Hague has not noticed. We then went to the New Testament, and selected examples, in which the word is applied to other things besides the religious rite. We thought it more important to settle the *Bible use*, than the pagan use of the term. But to this part of our work he makes no distinct reference. He does, in the beginning, say of the baptism of cups and couches, and of the Pharisaic washing of hands, that he *shall show* that they were immersions. But where he redeems his promise, we cannot discover. In one case he refers us to CALMET for proof that beds can be immersed: we have not found in Calmet any such proof, but much of a contrary nature. In connection with this point he quotes a Jewish rule as to ceremonial bathing, required by the law, to show, we suppose, that when the Pharisees\* observed their uncommanded custom of washing hands, they immersed themselves all over; and then asks if a Jewish Rabbi is not better authority than a New England clergyman. Does he expect to satisfy clear and honest minds by such means? No; let it be well understood, that our examples to show that the Bible use

\* As to the custom of the Pharisees, see Pres. Beecher's Letter, page 115.

of the term, *when not applied to the rite*, are clearly against immersion, and that Mr. Hague has not made an attempt to show the contrary, which requires an answer.

### JOHN'S BAPTISM.

Our remarks under this head, in our first treatise, we wish the reader to peruse again, in connection with what Mr. H. has said in reply. He sneers at our computation of the numbers baptized by John. The words of the evangelist are—“And there went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and the region round about Jordan.” These terms, literally understood, imply that more than a million flocked to John's baptism. We put it down at 500,000, as the least that could have been intended. This, Mr. Hague treats as ridiculous. We leave the reader to judge, whether he has met the point, as a fair reasoner, conscious of the strength of his positions. He also ridicules our translation of *many waters* at Enon. As there is no refuting a sneer, we will not argue this point with him. We will rather quote a few suggestions from Professor Stuart, whom Mr. Hague lauds so much, as one of “*those venerable veterans in theology*.” Now this same *venerable veteran in theology* says of this phrase, ἰδὲτα πολλά—“It has always seemed to me a very singular mode of expression, to designate the former idea,” i. e., that the waters were abundant, and deep, so as to be convenient for immersing. “Why not say, because the water was deep, or abundant, simply? A single brook, of very small capacity, but still a living stream, might, with scooping out a small place in the sand, answer most abundantly all the purposes of baptism, in case it were performed by immersion, and answer them just as well as many waters could. But, on the other hand, a single brook would not suffice for the accommodation of the great multitudes who flocked to John.”

“But let us now see what the idiom of the language de-

mands. In Matt. iii. 16, Mark i. 10, water designates the river Jordan. In Acts viii. 36—39, it is left uncertain by the text whether a stream or fountain of water is meant. In Rev. viii. 12, a '*third part of the waters,*' refers both to the rivers and fountains of water, that had just been mentioned, and so of, *of the waters* in the same verse. In Rev. xvii. 1, the angel says to John, 'I will show thee the punishment of the great harlot, who sitteth on *many waters*, i. e., many streams or rivers of water. In xvii. 15, the same phrase and idea is repeated. In Rev. xxii. 1, we find the expression, *river of water of life*, which in Rev. xxii. 17 is referred to, and called the water of life. In Rev. i. 15, xiv. 2, xix. 6, we have the expression, *voice of many waters*, which in two of the passages is followed by the expression, as the voice of thunder. Now it is the waves of the sea, probably, to which the writer here alludes. But these waves of the sea are successive, and, so to speak, different, and broken masses of water; not one continuous mass, deep and abundant. The simple idea of depth and abundance would not give birth to the conception of many waters. It is the *movement*, the *division*, the *succession*, and the *motion*, which form the ground of this idea."

"Of the evangelists, only Matthew and Mark use *ιδαγ* in the plural. Matthew employs it four times, viz., xiv. 28, 29, viii. 32, vii. 15. In the three former instances it designates the waters, as we say in the lake of Tiberias. In the latter it probably means *different or various streams or fountains of water*. In this last sense, Mark employs it in the only example in which the plural is used in his gospel, ix. 22. No other example of the plural occurs, till we come to the Apocalypse. Here, as we have seen, the waters or waves of the ocean are designated, in three instances, and in *nine instances*, *fountains and streams of water* are designated. No example then can be brought in the New Testament of the application of *ιδατα* to designate merely quantity of water, simply considered as deep and abounding."

Thus our own remarks on this subject are more than sustained. If the reader will read them again, and compare them with Mr. H.'s suggestions, he cannot fail to see where the truth of this matter lies.

### BAPTISM OF CHRIST.

Under this head, Mr. H. has said little that would be calculated to detract from the force of our remarks. The passage of scripture on which he relies to "*sweep all away*," is this—"It is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses *spoke nothing* concerning priesthood." "Here," continues Mr. Hague, "the apostle asserts, that no statute of the Mosaic law touched the priesthood of Christ, who pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar." Is it a fact, or do our eyes deceive us? Has Mr. H. thus penned a denial of the priesthood of Christ, in thus perverting the text of Paul? We have, for some time, noticed a growing disposition among Immersers to quote, as of special weight in this controversy, the opinions of German writers, who, in order to expunge the doctrine of the atonement from the gospel, seek to exclude from the rite of baptism the symbolical sprinkling of the blood of atonement. But we were not prepared to expect that *Mr. Hague* would deny the priesthood of Christ, in order to make out that he was immersed. This seems too great a sacrifice to carry so small a point.

But charity would hope that he does not mean so much, though he says it. Suppose he means only to say, that as Christ was a priest, not after the order of Aaron, but after that of Melchizedek, he required no ceremony of induction to office, i. e., no public introduction and manifestation to the people, in his official character. Then the express words of John should settle the question, who tells us that the great purpose of his own ministry was to usher in that of Christ, and manifest him to Israel in his official character: "I knew

him not, *but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore I am come baptizing with water.*"

Mr. H. intimates that the ceremony of Christ's baptism did not correspond with that of the induction of priests. But we ask what material circumstance was wanting? There was certainly the washing with water; and as to the clothing with priestly robes and anointing with oil, the two other parts of the ceremony—the voice from heaven speaking to the ear what the ceremonial investiture by robes spoke to the eye—and the visible pouring upon him of the Holy Spirit, actually accomplishing what all typical unctions had prefigured—these were even more than answering the demands of the ritual law. As all the Jewish ritual was typical of Christ, what fact or circumstance relating to him could have been typified by the typical priest's induction to office, if not Christ's own induction to office? And as the type of the pass-over terminated in the real offering of the sacrificial Lamb; was it not fitting, that the type of priestly ordination should terminate in the real ordination of the real Priest, over the house of God? This truth stands out with the clearness of a sunbeam, by the collected light of both the Old Testament and the New.

#### BAPTISM OF THE THREE THOUSAND.

Mr. H. thinks there was water in Jerusalem convenient for immersing three thousand in a fraction of a day, because there was enough to stand a siege. But water in wells might answer all the purposes of standing a siege, and yet not be very convenient for immersing. He tells us that Chrysostom immersed three thousand in one day. But as he gives no authority for so incredible a fact, and as we have found so many of his other statements worse than apocryphal, and as the thing in itself is impossible, we must be excused for saying that we do not believe it.



## BAPTISM OF THE ETHIOPIAN.

His suggestion as to the phrase, in Isaiah lii. 15,—“sprinkle many nations,” would probably not have been made, if the note which appeared in our second edition had been before him when he wrote. Since publishing that note, we have had the curiosity to consult all the Hebrew lexicons that have fallen in our way, and we find that only one out of the whole gives the least countenance to the rendering of the Seventy. Mr. H. says “Gesenius sanctions it, and throws light on its origin.” But how and why does he sanction it? The only sanction which he gives it, and the only light which he throws on its origin, is just to say, that the Seventy in that passage so render it. And *for that reason* he numbers the sense of *astonish* among its meanings—thus, “To cause to leap for joy or admiration. So, perhaps, Isa.—So shall he cause many nations to wonder at him.—Sept.”—And why does he give it even this *equivocal* sanction? Because he wishes to exclude from the Bible, as far as he can, the idea of Christ’s sprinkling the nations with his blood. Hence he sanctions the error of the Seventy, so far as he can without risking his own credit as a scholar, and no farther. Mr. H. should be a little more cautious of following in the wake of German neologists. But we see from the late forth-puttings of Newton Seminary, that the malaria from Germany is to spread its visitations upon the immersing denomination, and we fear to a greater extent than it has done with us; from the fact that neologists find declaring for immersion to be a convenient way of evading evangelical doctrines, and because, from their countenancing immersion, their writings are, in what Immersers regard a main point, peculiarly acceptable. But we hope that, in all their immersings, they will not be completely immersed in neology. A sprinkling of it has been quite enough for us.

But to return to the subject of Hebrew lexicons on Isa. lii. We have consulted Castellus’ Heptaglott Lexicon; also



the Pentaglott, and Robertson's and Pagninus' and Buxtorf's, and none of them give such a meaning as that of *astonish* to the word. The Pentaglott gives the meaning of sprinkle to the word in that passage. It gives also the meaning of the word in the Targums, and the cognate words in Chaldee and Arabic. So utterly groundless is the conceit, that that word, in every other place rendered properly, should here mean to astonish. Mr. Hague's suggestion that the eunuch read from the Seventy, we have already refuted. If he did read from that copy, he had an inspired teacher, who could give him the true meaning. It is really of no consequence, therefore, whether he read from the Seventy or not.

In confirmation of what we said respecting the absence of such water as was suitable for the immersion of the eunuch, let us bring the testimony of Eusebius. Treating of Hebrew topography, under the word Bedsour, he says—"There was a spring in the village of Bethsoron, twenty miles distant from Jerusalem, flowing from a mountain, in which the Ethiopian was baptized." This testimony is specially important, as it was written at an early period, when the truth in the case must have been known. Pococke testifies that the spring was to be seen in his day, i. e. two hundred years ago. Thus vanishes the last semblance of proof that the eunuch was immersed.

#### THE LORD'S SUPPER AND BAPTISM.

In attempting to discredit our principles of philology, Mr. Hague says that any one would be justified on the ground of them to drop the sacramental wine on his hand, and absorb it through his skin, and contend that in so doing he obeyed the command of our Lord—"Drink ye all of it." We should be very sorry to encourage such an evasion of a plain precept. But Mr. Hague's illustration fails for want of relevancy. There is but one mode of drinking common among men. Men never *drink* through the skin of the hand. The command to drink, therefore, is a specific command, to receive the liquid

into the mouth and swallow it. Men drink in no other way. There are, however, divers modes of *baptizing*. The dragon was not baptized in the same way with the ship to which Mr. Hague alludes; nor was the baptism practised by the Jews, *while lying on their couches*, like that administered to the naked candidates of the ancient church. According to customary usage, the word drink limits a man to one mode of receiving a liquid, that is, he must receive it through the mouth; the word baptize, on the other hand, admits of several ways of applying a liquid. Hence Mr. Hague's illustration is totally irrelevant. As he has alluded to the Lord's Supper, however, we will take the opportunity to test *his* principles. Suppose we should do the same with the word *supper* that he does with the word baptism. Then because *deipnon* (supper) primarily denotes a full meal, taken about the middle of the afternoon, and usually accompanied with excess and revelings, we must understand (according to Mr. Hague's principles) the command to observe the Lord's Supper, as enjoining upon us the duty of doing just what the Greeks were accustomed to do at the meal designated by this word. This was an error into which the Corinthian Greeks fell, and for which Paul sharply reproved them. See 1 Cor. xi. When words are taken from a common use and applied to a sacred rite, they must have a shade of meaning somewhat different from their ordinary signification. See page 10. Those, however, who insist on plunging because they think the original word classically signifies to plunge, should, for a like reason, insist upon eating a full meal at the Lord's table. Our immersing brethren have only to treat *deipnon* as they treat baptizo, and the Lord's table would immediately present a novel and disgusting scene.

#### THE OPINIONS AND PRACTICE OF THE EARLIER AGES OF THE CHURCH.

Our limits will admit of only a few remarks under this head; and yet these few may throw back some light upon the

question discussed in the preceding pages. Let it be understood that we distinguish between the apostolic and the primitive church. That immersion was not practised by the apostles, we have clearly shown, so far as a demonstration of the absence of all evidence can prove a negative proposition. In the ages succeeding them, it was no doubt the general mode of baptism. BUT IT WAS NEVER PRACTISED EXCLUSIVELY. During a period of many centuries, sprinkling was held to be valid baptism by the great body of Christians; and evidences of its practice are to be found in the testimony of the most distinguished men, reaching back to the earliest historical ages of the church. Let the reader consult Erasmus, Zanchius, Calvin, Martin Bucer, Thomas Aquinas, Gratian, Bernard, and the writers generally of the sixteenth, fifteenth, fourteenth, thirteenth, twelfth and eleventh centuries, and he will find ample testimony to this fact. Walfriedus Strabo A. D. 850—the venerable Bede, A. D. 670—Aurelius Prudentius, A. D. 390—severally speak of sprinkling as valid baptism. Prudentius represents John as baptizing by pouring. In the year 337, Constantine the Great was baptized by sprinkling. The fathers of the third and fourth centuries, Gregory Nazianzen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Basil, Lactantius, bear witness in various ways to the practice and validity of sprinkling. Cyprian was constituted bishop of Carthage in 248. This distinguished bishop could not have been ignorant of the opinions and practice of the church at that early period. Speaking of some who were baptized by sprinkling, he quotes the prophet Ezekiel, (Ez. xxxvi. 25,) “I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean;” and then adds—“Hence it appears that sprinkling is of equal validity with the salutary bath.”—Op., Lib. 2, Epis. 7. Is not the authority of Cyprian of more weight in this controversy than that of a “New England clergyman?” Origen and Tertullian both lived within one hundred years of the apostles; and they unitedly testify to the practice and validity of baptism by affusion or

sprinkling. The same may be said of Clemens Alexandrinus and Irenæus, the first of whom lived within fifty years of the apostles, and the last of whom was born about the time the beloved John fell asleep. Such are the facts. IT WAS NOT UNTIL AFTER THE REFORMATION, IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY, THAT ANY SECT OF CHRISTIANS CONSIDERED IMMERSION AS ESSENTIAL TO BAPTISM.

The question now very naturally occurs, What was the occasion of the beginning and prevalence of immersion? The modern advocates for exclusive immersion *take it for granted* that the early Christians practised this mode *because they believed the original word rendered it imperatively necessary*. But this position is wholly untenable. There are many considerations, which conclusively prove that the practice in question originated in no such belief.

1. It is not necessary to suppose such a belief, to account for the prevalence of the practice.

2. The word has no such restricted meaning, but is used of divers modes of applying a liquid, as has been clearly proved. The English scholar would as soon limit our word *go* to some one mode of travelling, as the ancient fathers limit *baptize* to one mode of using water.

3. Every fact which proves that the fathers did not consider immersion *essential*, proves also that they did not understand *the word as requiring immersion*. If they had understood Christ as saying, in so many words, “go and immerse,” they must have insisted on that one mode as *essential*. But they never considered it as *essential*.

4. That the early fathers did not consider the word as a synonyme of immersion, is evident from the ~~fact~~ that they speak of *sprinkling* as *baptism*. Mr. Hague could not speak of sprinkling as baptism. He believes that *baptism* is precisely equivalent to our English word *immersion*. For Mr. Hague, therefore, to call sprinkling baptism, would be as absurd as to call sprinkling immersion. But the fathers could

speak of sprinkling as baptism ; and they felt not Mr. Hague's difficulty, for the plain reason, that their views of the import of the word were radically different from his.

5. The fathers never base an argument for immersion on the import of the word. This is a very remarkable fact. The modern advocates of exclusive immersion rest their argument almost entirely upon the word. The word is immerse, they say, and therefore we must immerse. But there is nothing like this to be found in the writings of the ancient fathers. Why did they not take the same position with modern Immersers? Because they held altogether different views. Why did they not defend immersion on philological grounds? Because they knew that on such grounds it could not be defended.

6. The fathers and early Christians used the word in a sense as indeterminate as our word wash, and in instances where there could have been *no immersion*. They speak of the *shedding* of blood as baptism—of the baptism of *tears*—of baptism by *martyrdom*, &c.

7. The fathers expressly state that the power of baptism does not depend on the *quantity* of water used.

8. It is abundantly evident from their writings, that they understood baptizo, in its application to the Christian rite, in some generic sense, which left the mode of using the water undefined.

9. They themselves practised immersion, sprinkling, and affusion.

In view of these facts, we are not at liberty to take it for granted that the fathers immersed, because they believed that βαπτίζω means only to immerse. Indeed, it is quite clear that they were not led to adopt this form of baptism by any such belief. If such an understanding of the word had been the source of their practice, their practice would have been always uniform. They never could have used the word to denote *divers modes* of applying a liquid. With them it must then



have carried invariably the sense of immersion. They *never* could have called sprinkling baptism, if they had considered that word a synonyme of immersion. Since, therefore, their practice was not uniform; since they were accustomed to employ βαπτισμα in cases where the idea of immersion was not involved; since they called sprinkling baptism, and acknowledged its validity,—we are under the necessity of looking to something distinct from the word as the source of their practice. That they held no sentiments respecting this word in common with the modern advocates of exclusive immersion, is absolutely certain. How, then, shall we account for the introduction and prevalence of this form of baptism in the early ages of the church? There are *three* causes assigned by Pres. Beecher, which are amply sufficient to solve the mystery. 1. Oriental usages, and the habits of warmer regions. 2. A false interpretation of Rom. vi. 3, 4, and Col. ii. 12. 3. A very early habit of ascribing peculiar virtue to external forms. See Bib. R., Vol. V., Jan. 1841.

We showed in our former treatise, that in those scripture baptisms which took place near a stream, the parties stepped into the stream *for affusion*. Now a people accustomed to bathing, and in those warm climates where Christianity first began to plant her churches and administer her ordinances, would very easily slide into the practice of immersion, especially if there existed in their minds any predisposing causes. And such causes did exist in the strong tendencies towards superstition which characterized the primitive Christians. While the church was yet in its infancy, and after it had lost the guidance of inspired teachers, it was liable to fall into many errors. Its members were but babes in Christian knowledge. If the churches, which have been gathered from the most refined of the modern pagan nations, should be deprived of the guiding and moulding influence of the missionary, how long would they continue to hold the truth in its purity? There is, with many, a habit of regarding the primitive Christians, in the age



immediately succeeding the apostolic, as perfect models of excellence, and infallible expounders of the gospel. But we might with almost equal reason expect to find Christianity in her loveliest form among the converted savages of the Sandwich Islands. The church in that age was made up of persons gathered out from under the pompous superstitions of heathenism, and exposed to a thousand influences still bearing them towards superstition. Even in the very days of the apostles, Paul had more than he could do to resist this tendency to superstition which thus early developed itself in the converts. *Now it was chiefly this disposition, which originated and fostered the practice of immersion.* Minds so inclined would not be likely to be satisfied with the plain simplicity of the Christian rites as our Lord left them, but would naturally seek to make them more impressive. And it is a fact incontrovertibly established, THAT ON NO SUBJECT DID SUPERSTITION SO LUXURIATE, AS UPON BAPTISM. With immersion came in accompanying superstitions, *as immersing three times, the use of consecrated water, anointing with oil, signing with the sign of the cross, exorcism, eating milk and honey, putting on of white garments, anointing the eyes and ears, and the stripping of men and women perfectly naked, to denote their moral nakedness before the putting on of Christ.* Now these were parts of the immersion of the early church. The same men who practised immersion, practised these fooleries. They all come down to us as one parcel. They can all boast a date equally ancient. And those authors that claim for immersion an apostolic origin, *claim the same for its accompaniments.* Take as a specimen Romanus' book on "Ancient Rites," published at Frankfort, A. D. 1681. He contends that the use of the consecrated water was handed down from the apostles, as was also the custom of touching the nose and ears, and that of exorcism, &c. He farther very gravely informs us that females stripped themselves for baptism. and came out of the

water in a state of nudity; and that they were not permitted to consult the timidity and modesty of their sex. The reason on which this practice was grounded was this—"that Christ suffered naked, and that females as well as others must imitate Christ;" just as it is now pretended that we must be immersed because (as it is falsely alleged) Christ was immersed. Romanus quotes Cyril as exclaiming—"O admirable spectacle! Ye were naked in the sight of all, and were not ashamed. So you imitate Adam, who was naked in Paradise, and was not ashamed. Yea, you imitate him who was naked on the cross, even Christ." Now is it to be believed that our Lord ever instituted this mode of baptism? Could his apostles have sanctioned such superstitious usages? And yet we see them flourishing in the early church, as accompaniments of immersion, and coevals with it.

The fact that immersion came into the church in such company, is conclusive proof that it was the offspring of those superstitious propensities, to which even such men as Tertulian and Cyprian were in bondage.

The Greek and Latin fathers are confessedly not safe guides as scriptural annotators; and their *practice* is not to be received as the criterion of truth. Nevertheless, it is freely admitted that they must have understood the usual import of βαπτίζω, a term familiar to them as our household words. But why did they not base the propriety of immersion on the meaning of this word? This is the whole of Mr. Hague's argument. But this *they* never essayed to do. The fathers well knew that the word could not be restricted in its signification to one mode of using water. They knew that it was frequently employed to denote *an effect*, such as cleansing or purifying, without reference to *mode*. With their perfect knowledge of the force of the word, they could not take the ground assumed by Mr. Hague. If they preferred immersion, it was for reasons which led them to practise trine immersion, the anointing with oil, &c. The great idea, however, which they

attached to *the word*, was *purification*. IN ALL THEIR WRITINGS, THEY INVARIABLY USE IT AS SYNONYMOUS WITH καθαριζω, TO PURIFY. This generic sense defines no one particular mode of using the water. As religious purifying might be done by immersion, with their superstitious tendencies they would naturally show a partiality for that mode; and as it could also be done by affusion or sprinkling, they could *consistently* allow the validity of other modes. Believing that βαπτισμα, as a religious term, was employed in the generic sense of to purify, the fathers very properly inferred that that which was *essential* to the Christian rite was *the use of clean water*, and not the *mode* of its use.

If the reader wishes to see this point ably discussed, we refer him to the articles in the Biblical Repository, on the import of Baptizo, from the pen of Dr. Edward Beecher. Dr. Beecher proves most triumphantly, not only that the Greek and Latin fathers understood baptizo in the generic sense of to purify, but that this *is* its meaning as a *religious term*. These articles have been before the public for nearly two years. The advocates of exclusive immersion have not been ignorant of their publication. Mr. Hague betrays his knowledge of their existence by his wayside thrust at Pres. Beecher. Mr. Cushman alludes to them *very prettily* under the image of a new star rising in the West. But why has no one this side of the Atlantic attempted a reply to them? They are unanswerable.

And here we cannot forbear to ask—Is it *reasonable* to suppose, that our Lord intended that the *mode* of using the water should be considered the *essential* part of the baptismal rite? The true spiritual baptism is purification. The external rite is designed only as the shadow of this reality. Is not the use of clean water all that is needed to symbolize this effect? But if Christ intended to lay the stress on the *mode* of using the water, why did he not select a word of the most specific sig-

nification? If a servant had received a command to *go* to New York, and some of his friends should insist that he ought to *walk*, and that *walking* was essential to obedience, it would be very natural for him to ask, "Why did not my master bid me *walk*, if he designed to confine me to this particular *mode* of *going*?" Or, if he had received an injunction to *wash* himself, and some one should tell him that he must *bathe* himself, and that this *mode* of washing is *essential* to obedience, he might very properly inquire, "Why then did not my master use a word of more definite signification? If he intended to make some *particular mode* of washing essential, why did he not *specify* that mode?" From the fact that his master had employed a word denoting simply an effect without reference to mode, that servant might justly conclude that he designed to lay no stress upon any one particular *mode* of washing. The application of these remarks to the subject under discussion is easy. *Our Lord might have used words of more definite signification.* The word *dupto* denotes specifically *to dip* or *dive under*. If he intended to make immersion *essential* to a right performance of the Christian rite, why did he not employ this word? The Greek word *rantizo* denotes specifically *sprinkling*—the word *ekcheo* denotes specifically *pouring*. Now if Christ intended to give essential importance to any one particular *mode* of using water, why did he not make choice of one of those words, which so clearly define *modes*? The fact that he employed a word which is capable of denoting *effects* without reference to mode, as washing, cleansing, purifying, &c., is conclusive proof that he never designed, that any one particular mode of using water should be considered *essential* to the validity of the rite.

But, furthermore, what supposable analogy could have led our Lord to fix upon *immersion*? Of the three modes of using the symbolic water, it is certainly the least appropriate. Indeed, to employ it in representing the effects of the Holy Spirit's operations upon the human soul, seems to be a mon-

strous perversion of language. Those effects are purity, joy, peace, &c. Now it is very common to speak of being *immersed* in care and trouble, of being immersed in debt, of being immersed in sloth, &c. The term is frequently used to denote *something disagreeable and oppressive*. But who ever thinks of describing that which is pleasant and joyous by such a term? Immersed in purity—immersed in joy—immersed in peace—immersed in humility—it is barbarous phraseology! If our Lord had designed to make some one particular mode of using the emblematic water essential, analogy would have led him to fix upon either of the other modes before immersion. See pp. 19, 20, 21.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS.

The reader has now both sides of the controversy before him, and will judge for himself where the truth lies. If Mr. Hague has succeeded in sweeping away the positions assumed in our former treatise; if he has demonstrated that the term baptize always specifies one particular *mode* of using a liquid, and that that mode is immersion; if he has shown that our blessed Lord, and all others whom John baptized, were immersed; if he has proved that the apostles invariably immersed their converts;—in a word, if he has made it clear that this mode of administering the rite is essential to its validity, and that it was so considered by the apostles and the early fathers of the church—if he has satisfactorily done all this, then let Mr. Hague be followed as the true guide. But, on the other hand, if our positions stand firm, notwithstanding his effort to move them from their basis; if no satisfactory proof has yet been brought forward, showing that the apostles and fathers deemed the particular *mode* of using the purifying water, for which Mr. Hague contends, *essential* to baptism; if the controverted term, like our words *go, travel, dye, wash, purify, &c.*, denotes an effect without reference to mode, and this is proved by *examples* from both inspired and uninspired writers—



then Mr. Hague is sadly in the wrong. He wears a yoke of bondage which Christ Jesus has not imposed upon his followers. And because he would debar us from the Lord's table for not bowing our necks to this yoke, he is guilty of infringing our Christian liberty, and of exercising an usurped authority in the church.

In coming to a final decision, let the reader not forget, that the advocates of exclusive immersion assume more responsibility than we do, and have more to prove. Their principles of close communion lay them under obligations to show, BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT, that the *mode* of baptism adopted by them is *essential* to the validity of the rite, or, as Mr. Hague gives us to understand, *is the rite itself*. If the reader fails, therefore, to discover that degree of certainty on either side which he could desire; if after all it appears to be a matter of mere conjecture where the truth lies; if the evidence on both sides seems to be almost equally balanced, and he can arrive at no conclusion which is perfectly satisfactory—then, in fact, the question is settled in our favor. For what intelligent and candid mind could ever feel justified in basing close communion upon an external ceremony of *doubtful obligation*? Will the reader presume to enforce on others a religious ceremony, the obligatory nature of which is not fully made out in his own mind? Shall not Christian liberality have the advantage of his doubts? Will he disown and reject from the communion and fellowship of the saints a large proportion of the most devoted Christians in the world, before he is *quite sure* that obedience to his Divine Master renders it necessary? Nothing is more certain than that our blessed Lord must be better pleased with that disposition in a disciple, which leads him to err on the side of Christian kindness than with the spirit of exclusiveness and intolerance. Before the reader comes to a final decision, then, let him put the argument in favor of immersion to the test of the inquiry—*Is*



*this sure and satisfactory ground on which to base close communion?*

We offer not these remarks because we feel that obscurity hangs about the question in dispute. To us, the path of duty is clear. Mr. Hague very charitably insinuates that our confidence arises from the limitation of our views. As to that matter, the reader will judge between him and us. We will only say, that the farther we carry our examination, the more settled is our conviction that exclusive immersion is directly opposed to the will of Christ.

Towards the advocates of exclusive immersion we cherish no unkind feelings. Among them are many with whom we are familiarly acquainted, and whose friendship we highly value. But with their exclusive principle we have no sympathy. It is a pity that brethren, who embrace a common faith with us, who are enlisted under the same banners, and who will finally sit with us as guests at the Marriage Supper of the Lamb, should here on earth feel under the necessity of spreading a separate table. In this respect they maintain an unenviable singularity. How long shall it be so? How long shall their churches be the only place on earth, or in heaven, where the true disciple receives no welcome to the full communion of the saints? Surely the sooner this exclusive principle is extirpated the better. Why will not our brethren catch the spirit of one of their brightest luminaries, the illustrious Robert Hall? Let his sentiments prevail, and we should hail the dawn of a brighter day. Such a reformation, such a union of Christian brethren, as the adoption of his principles would effect, (to use his own language,) "would be a nearer approach to the ultimate triumph of the church, than the annals of time have yet recorded. In the accomplishment of our Savior's prayer, we should behold a demonstration of the divinity of his mission which the most impious could not resist; we should behold in the church a peaceful haven, inviting us to retire from the tossings and perils of this

unquiet ocean to a sacred enclosure, a sequestered spot, which the storms and tempests of the world were not permitted to invade.

'Intus aquæ dulces, vivoque sedilia saxo:  
Nympharum domus. Hic fessas non vincula naves  
Ulla tenent: unco non adligat anchora morsu.'

“The genius of the gospel, let it once for all be remembered, is not ceremonial, but spiritual; consisting not in meats or drinks, or outward observances, but in the cultivation of such interior graces as compose the essence of virtue, perfect the character, and purify the heart. These form the soul of religion; all the rest are but her terrestrial attire, which she will lay aside when she passes the threshold of eternity. When, therefore, the obligations of humility and love come into competition with a punctual observance of external rites, the genius of religion will easily determine to which we should incline.”

## APPENDIX.

## NOTE A.

AFTER quoting a passage from Tyndal, (page 77,) Mr. Hague says —“*Probably Mr. Towne was not aware of the existence of such a passage from the pen of Tyndal, or he would not have spoken as he has done.*” Wonderful! If this passage was quoted merely to show that Mr. Hague in this particular had read somewhere a quotation from Tyndal, which Mr. Towne never saw, and Mr. Hague never saw in its place in its own book, it is to the point. But if it was quoted as a refutation of any statement of ours respecting Tyndal, it falls far short of the mark. Does it show that Tyndal was not the translator of the New Testament? No. Does it show that he translated it according to the principle of Immersers? No. Does it show that he practised immersion? No. That he in any way sustained “the assumption,” “that the word signifies *only* immersion?” No.

If it be any mystery that Tyndal so expressed himself as to allow, as we do, that plunging might be baptism, Mr. Hague himself has solved that mystery, by a similar quotation from Cowper, in a note on the same page, in which it appears that Cowper, as well as Tyndal, thought such figures of speech not incongruous with the anti-immersing theory. And if still more light is wanting, Dr. Manton, on Romans vi., uses essentially the same illustration which Mr. H. has quoted from Tyndal; and in the same page decidedly contends against the Immerser’s theory. Mr. Hague must indeed be grateful for small favors, if he can make so much of a casual figurative expression, from one so decidedly against him.

## NOTE B.

Mr. Hague says—“Very few baptisms [immersions] in this country trace their pedigree to Roger Williams.” But, according to his own account of the matter, it was more than twenty years after the organizing of Roger Williams’ church before the first church of English Immersers was established in New England. And if that church, in that time, occupying the focus of the immersing interest, did not beget and send forth immersing children, so as to cover a larger portion of the immersing field than a church established twenty years after, it had a rare experience. But what if it were so? did not the branches of Mr. Williams’ church baptize? and were Immersers ever in the habit of discrediting those baptisms, as Mr. Hague now virtually does? Was any distinction from that day to this ever observed between immersions having a domestic, and those having a foreign origin? Would any advocate for immersion now deem it a defect in his baptism, should he find that it came in direct line from the unapostolic baptism of Williams? If not, of what value are Mr. Hague’s suggestions on that point?

## NOTE C.

## THE NEW BIBLE.

It has been announced in the papers, that the new translation of the Bible has been published; though we have not yet seen it. We understand, that, while it substitutes immerse and immersion for baptize and baptism, in most cases, it excepts the case of John the Baptist; and forbears to carry out its principle, so as to say, as it should, JOHN THE IMMERSER. What is the matter? Has a distinction after all been found between immersing and baptizing? Or are our friends afraid to call things by their right names? Or are they afraid that others will, if they do; and so that they shall lose the advantage which they now have in a monopoly of the name Baptist? Whatever evils may follow this attempt to give currency to a sectarian Bible—however much it is to be deplored that sectarianism has now at last invaded the Bible itself, this good will result from it—the public will have a practical illustration of the absurdity of the principle, which makes immersion to be everywhere identical with baptism.

## NOTE D.

## THE GREEK CHURCH.

The view which we have given of the origin of immersion in the primitive church, accounts satisfactorily for the existing practice of the Greek church, and is more than an answer to Mr. Hague's quotations on that subject. But we cannot forbear to cite a few sentences from Dr. Beecher's work, named above. "The opinion of the Greek church is often alleged as decisive in favor of the meaning immerse. Being by name the *Greek* church, it is inferred, of course, that they must be good judges of the import of a Greek word. In reply to this, I would ask—Is modern Italian ancient Latin? If not, neither is modern Greek ancient Greek. That modern Greek resembles its ancient stock more than Italian does the Latin, I do not deny. But the resemblance is not such, that the opinion of a modern Greek scholar, on a point like this, is worth any more than that of a modern German, Italian, or English scholar. No man can form an opinion on this subject, except by a study of the facts found in the ancient writers, who exhibit the usage in question; and his opinion is worth most, who most carefully investigates, compares, classifies and judges in view of the whole case. And if this be so, the opinions of the modern Greek church, unsustained by argument, ought to have no peculiar weight. Their proficiency in philological studies certainly does not exceed that of other European scholars, to say nothing of those of America."

BAPTISMAL QUESTION, NO. II.

---

AN

EXAMINATION

OF THE

REV. MESSRS. COOKE AND TOWNE'S

REJOINDER TO THE REVIEW

OF THEIR

HINTS TO AN INQUIRER

ON THE

SUBJECT OF BAPTISM.

---

BY WILLIAM HAGUE,

Pastor of Federal St. Baptist Church.

---

BOSTON:

GOULD, KENDALL AND LINCOLN,  
59 WASHINGTON STREET.

1842.

304.  
1/21/1912

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1842,  
By GOULD, KENDALL & LINCOLN,  
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

---

~~~~~  
William S. Damrell, Printer, No. 11 Cornhill.



## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

Absence from home on several summer excursions, followed by severe sickness, has prevented me from replying to the Rejoinder of Rev. Messrs. Cooke and Towne, with that degree of promptness with which a discussion of this sort should ever be pursued, unless it be brought to some clear and definite issue. As the delay has been caused by the dispensation of a kind and unerring Providence, I have cheerfully acquiesced, knowing that "my times are in his hand," that the hairs of our heads are all numbered, and that from the minutest events of life, He often brings forth great and lasting good.

Although I could employ my pen on many subjects, more agreeably than on this controverted one, respecting which, so many esteemed friends differ, yet, inasmuch as the initiating rite of the Christian religion is a part of that heritage of truth which Christ has left us, and which we are commanded to preserve in its purity, I could not with a clear conscience, be silent, when others are so active in inculcating views of baptism, which seem to me entirely to set aside the original ordinance enjoined by Christ in the great commission, and which he designed to be kept in its primitive simplicity, "unto the end of the world." I have written only in defence. So have most others, who have published any thing on the same side of the question. It was long since observed by the excellent Dr. Ryland, that "often as we have been charged with intemperate zeal on this subject, it is remarkable that most of our principal writers have only *replied* to attacks first made on our denomination; for example, Dr. Gale

to Dr. Wall ; Mr. Stennett to Mr. Russen ; Dr. Gill to Maurice, Bostwick, Towgood, Mayo, &c. ; Dr. Stennett to Dr. Addington." So in this city, very little, if any thing, has been published by us, except in reply to others. Dr. Baldwin wrote more largely than any of his brethren, but it was in *answer* to the arguments of Dr. Worcester, of Salem.

If it should seem to any reader, that, in the present production I have expressed too strong a confidence in the correctness of our opinions, let me ask such an one to consider the fact, that on no question in theology, is there a more extensive agreement of opinion throughout the greater part of Christendom, than on this, *what was the mode of apostolic baptism?* The Greek and Latin churches are the largest in the world. The Greeks charge the Latins with having altered the primitive immersion into sprinkling. The Latins own the fact, and assert the right of the Church to alter. It is impossible that any historical question could be settled on clearer evidences, so that it was not without reason, that a celebrated mathematician, Dr. Gregory, author of the "Letters on the Evidences of Christianity," took occasion once to say, that it is "the only question in theology, where the evidence is all on one side." The great peculiarity of the Baptists is in strictly adhering to what is so widely acknowledged to have been apostolic, saying, as they do, that if "the Bible is the only rule of faith," we must, as consistent Protestants, conform our *practice* to the rule, and show our faith, by our works, our love, by our obedience.

# CONTENTS.

|                                                                                                                      | Page.   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| INTRODUCTION. Spirit of the Rejoinder, .....                                                                         | 5       |
| EXAMINATION OF ALLEGED ERRORS.                                                                                       |         |
| 1. LUKE'S quotation from Isaiah, in Acts 8: 32, .....                                                                | 7       |
| 2. TURRETIN'S testimony to the proper sense of baptize, .....                                                        | 8-12    |
| His proof of it by the Sybilline verse, .....                                                                        | 13      |
| His agreement on that point with Beza, Casaubon and Witsius, ...                                                     | 16      |
| The Sybilline verse, a test of the force of the word, .....                                                          | 21      |
| 3. LUTHER'S testimony to the proper sense of the word, .....                                                         | 23      |
| Lutheran theologians cited, .....                                                                                    | 24      |
| 4. SCAPULA'S testimony,—drawn from Stephanus, .....                                                                  | 26-29   |
| 5. The <i>concessions</i> of other Pedobaptist writers, .....                                                        | 29      |
| 6. On immersions among the Jews, .....                                                                               | 31      |
| 7. On the testimony of the lexicons,—SCHLEUSNER, WAHL and BRET-<br>SCHNEIDER, .....                                  | 32      |
| 8. 9. 10. On the testimony of other lexicographers, .....                                                            | 33      |
| The principal mistake of the authors of the Rejoinder, .....                                                         | 44      |
| PRINCIPLES OF PHILOLOGY, .....                                                                                       | 45      |
| 1. These of <i>essential</i> importance,—misstatement of them, .....                                                 | 47      |
| 2. What the fundamental principles really are, .....                                                                 | 48-50   |
| 3. Difference between the <i>meaning</i> of a word and its <i>application</i> , .....                                | 50      |
| 4. Further elucidation of the philological error of the Rejoinder, .....                                             | 52-57   |
| 5. Professor STUART'S testimony, .....                                                                               | 53      |
| 6. THOLUCK'S remark on an important distinction, .....                                                               | 59      |
| 7. Refutation of the Rejoinder on the citation from Josephus, .....                                                  | 60      |
| 8. Refutation of the Rejoinder on other citations, .....                                                             | 61-63   |
| 9. The false philology of the Rejoinder proved by English words of its<br>own selection, viz., SPRING and BAR, ..... | 63-64   |
| APPLICATION OF OUR ARGUMENT TO THE LORD'S SUPPER, .....                                                              | 66      |
| The philology of the Rejoinder the same as that of Romish writers on<br>the mass, .....                              | 68      |
| Infant sprinkling the "weak point" of Protestantism, .....                                                           | 69      |
| EXAMINATION OF STATEMENTS IN THE INTRODUCTION TO THE REJOINDER,                                                      | 70      |
| ON ARGUMENTS OMITTED IN THE REVIEW OF THE HINTS, .....                                                               | 74      |
| Reason for the omission, .....                                                                                       | 74      |
| Statement of the favorite argument drawn from the mode of the Spirit's<br>influence, .....                           | 76      |
| Seven proofs that this argument <i>assumes</i> what is not true, .....                                               | 77-89   |
| Four proofs that the <i>principle</i> of the argument is fallacious, .....                                           | 90-94   |
| BURIAL WITH CHRIST IN BAPTISM, .....                                                                                 | 95      |
| Five objections to the common interpretation set aside, .....                                                        | 96-100  |
| The substitute for the common interpretation refuted, .....                                                          | 101     |
| Proofs that the common interpretation is the right one, .....                                                        | 103-108 |
| LEARNED CRITICS AND THEOLOGIANs, .....                                                                               | 109     |
| The claim of the Baptists to the testimony of those cited in the Review,<br>vindicated, .....                        | 109-113 |
| LITERATURE OF THE WORLD, .....                                                                                       | 114     |
| THE CITATIONS OF THE CLASSICS, .....                                                                                 | 115     |
| EXAMINATION OF PRESIDENT BEECHER'S LETTER TO MR. TOWNE, .....                                                        | 118     |
| COMPLIANCE WITH MESSRS. COOKE AND TOWNE'S REQUEST, .....                                                             | 129     |
| SIMILARITY OF THE ARGUMENTS FOR UNIVERSALISM AND SPRINKLING, ...                                                     | 130     |
| BAPTISM OF BEDS, .....                                                                                               | 131     |
| JOHN'S BAPTISM, .....                                                                                                | 133     |
| BAPTISM OF CHRIST, .....                                                                                             | 134     |
| BAPTISM OF THE THREE THOUSAND, .....                                                                                 | 135     |
| BAPTISM OF THE ETHIOPIAN,—BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER, .....                                                       | 137     |
| HOW SPRINKLING CAME TO BE CALLED BAPTISM, .....                                                                      | 138     |
| THE ARGUMENT FROM FIGURES, .....                                                                                     | 138     |
| BRIEF SUMMARY, .....                                                                                                 | 139     |
| CONCLUSION, .....                                                                                                    | 142     |



## EXAMINATION.

---

It gave me pleasure to learn from a public paper, that the gentlemen whose "Hints to an Inquirer on the subject of Baptism" I had had occasion to review, were intending to furnish a reply. Not that I wished to protract the controversy, but such was the position in which they were left in regard to many of their statements, that justice to themselves, as Christian teachers, seemed to require that they should bring forward some new explanations, or, in case they saw that they had gone too far, or said aught inadvertently, that they should present a candid retraction. Indeed, as to some points, it seemed to me quite probable that they would do the latter, especially, considering that their articles were first prepared for the columns of a newspaper, and that in that kind of writing one is easily tempted to use expressions which calm reflection will not justify. They have chosen, however, to unite again, in an attempt to avert the force of the testimonies which I produced against them, and to countenance each other in reaffirming all that they had said. The reader is aware that in preparing my first review, I had the impression that the Rev. Mr. Towne, one of our city pastors, was the sole author of the work then before me. It was with surprise I learned that there was connected with him in the effort, a senior brother belonging to the editorial corps. This fact explained much that seemed strange in the matter and spirit of the production. The work now under consideration bears with it also the air

of the editor's office, rather than of the minister's study. The presiding genius of the one place is certainly different from that of the other. Their proper employments are different, and they lead men to cultivate different moods of mind, and different styles of expression. In the office, one is more affected by the hurry and din of business, and more easily forms a habit of hasty examination and of adventurous assertion, tinged with a glow of party feeling; in the study, there is far more that is favorable to calm thought, to thorough research, and the spirit of devotion. A production from the office, we are not much surprised to see imbued with the elements of strife, reeking wet with "the waters of Meribah;" but that which comes from the study, we expect to be pervaded with the genial spirit of candor, charity, and truth, all baptized in "Siloa's brook, which flows fast by the oracle of God." Whatever, then, in the work before us, seems not in keeping with the air and character of the pastor's study, we may trace to its home in a place less near to heaven.

This last remark I make the more readily, because in an editorial article of the *Puritan*, the sentiment was some time since openly avowed, that in the baptismal controversy a sort of *tact* in meeting unreasonable prejudice was much more needed than *talent*; and that instead of solid argument, there was wanted a "skill in shooting airy fancies on the wing." Much more appeared, of the same import, showing that it was the writer's aim to study how to say those things which would make an impression on the popular ear, without much regard to the established principles of reasoning. After reading the declaration of a sentiment like this, justifying as it does a certain kind of hardihood and recklessness of expression, merely for the sake of effect, I should have been quite indisposed to notice any publication on baptism bearing the name of Mr. Cooke alone, unless indeed it were accompanied with a frank and ample



retractation. As I have replied, however to his article, while supposing Mr. Towne to be the only writer, I feel bound now to proceed with an examination of this new work of their joint authorship.

In glancing at the pamphlet now under review, I cannot but sympathize with the feelings of the honest inquirer, who, having read this Rejoinder, should ask in a tone of despondency, "Who can tell what is truth? If men who ought to be competent witnesses of facts differ in their testimony, on what are we to depend?" Nevertheless, let such an one take courage. Let him resolve to be true to himself, to use all the means of knowledge which God has given him, to *act* according to the light he receives, and with sincere prayer for the divine blessing, he will not be left to grope in doubt. In the case before us, if he will give me his attention through the following pages, I trust that he will more clearly see the sources of those discrepancies of opinion and assertion which have tended most to perplex him.

The more easily to meet the wants of every reader, I will announce the following method, which I shall pursue in discussing the merits of the Rejoinder:

I. I shall examine our authors' list of my "erroneous statements of facts and authorities."

II. Consider the section, which involves the turning point of the controversy, entitled, "Principles of Philology." (p. 106.)

III. Review the other sections of the pamphlet, in the order of their occurrence.

First of all, then, the list of errors demands our attention. This commences on the 88th page. The first error is thus stated:

"**ERROR 1.** We adduced the passage, 'He shall sprinkle many nations,' as proof that the mind of the Ethiopian eunuch had been directed, previous to his baptism, to sprinkling; and hence we inferred a proba-

bility that he was sprinkled. To this Mr. Hague replies: 'Strange assertion! Here I ask, did not Mr. Towne know that the version of the Seventy (in which the word translated *sprinkle* is rendered *astonish*) is the *very one* from which Luke *quotes the passage in question?* The evangelist himself takes the text of the Seventy, word for word.' Such is Mr. Hague's assertion; and yet the evangelist *does not quote word for word* from the Seventy, but departs from that version in four instances in less than four lines, as will be seen by the note below."

The reader will certainly unite with me in a feeling of astonishment at this remark, when I refer him to another source of information on the point. The first American edition of Dr. Bloomfield's Greek Testament was published in Boston in the year 1837, with a preface by Prof. Stuart. It is remarkable for the purity of the text, and the attention given to that subject. On Luke's quotation from Isaiah (Acts 8: 32), Dr. Bloomfield says in his note, "These words are taken from Isaiah 53: 7, 8, and follow the Septuagint version EXACTLY; the verbal discrepancies which occur *not being found in the Alexandrian and OTHER GOOD manuscripts of the Septuagint.*" Now, what must I think of the accuracy of my opponents as critics and reasoners, when they call that "Mr. Hague's assertion," which is not only set forth in standard works, but even in those which are republished in our own city from European editions, and, of course, must be to them easy of access? I would not for a moment admit the thought, that they would say any thing contrary to their knowledge of the fact; but as the means of information were at hand, I marvel that they did not use them.

The second charge of erroneous statement is thus made:

"ERROR 2. On page 76, he says that Turretin agrees with him in opinion as to immersion. Now,

what is it to agree with Mr. Hague on this subject? It is to maintain that the word has one signification, and one only. But scarcely a writer of equal note, since the days of the apostles, expresses himself more decidedly against this view than Turretin. We will quote the substance of his remarks, and give the reader his own words in a note below."

I really ought to express my thanks to our authors for giving us Turretin's "own words in a note below," for I do not know of a case in all the annals of controversy, where men have so readily furnished the means of their own refutation. How completely this has been done in the present instance, we shall see in a moment, when we come to examine the passage. Before doing so, however, I would premise two remarks.

(1.) I wish to state with more perfect precision than my reviewers have done, what it is *to agree with me* on the subject of baptism. They have expressed it rather loosely. It is not to maintain that "the word has one meaning, and one only," for almost every word in every language has a great variety of figurative or tropical meanings, and men daily give to words new figurative applications. But it is to maintain that this word has only one *proper* or *literal* meaning. "The first important division or distinction of words, in respect to their meaning" (says Ernesti\*), "is into *proper* and *tropical*, i. e., literal and figurative, or (better still), primary and secondary." "A *proper* word is a definite name given to a certain thing, and as such may be explained by adverting to the *proper names* of persons. A *tropical* word is one used out of its proper, i. e., original sense, as, *rosy* face, *snowy* skin, where *rosy* and *snowy* cannot be literally or properly predicated of the skin. The names *trope* and *tropical* come from the Greek word *tropos* (τροπος), inversion, change." Here an important principle is stated. No man can be a competent inter-

---

\* Principles of Interpretation, Prof. Stuart's translation, p. 21.

preter, who does not distinguish accurately between literal and figurative language. The Papists defend Transubstantiation,—the monstrous doctrine, that in the eucharist, the bread and wine are changed into the real body and blood of Christ,—chiefly by confounding the distinction between *tropical* and *proper* words in the passage, “This is my body—this is my blood.” The most enormous errors in religion have arisen from neglecting this distinction; and in theological discussions, the first important question often is, at the outset, whether the language in a disputed text be literal or figurative. Such an inquiry is indispensable; for by means of a figure or trope, a word is sometimes made to denote just the reverse of what it properly signifies. For instance, there is one kind of hyperbole called *auxesis*, which enlarges the meaning, and another called *meiosis*, which diminishes it. According to the first, Cowley, the poet, calls a copious sprinkling or wetting, *drowning*; as when he says of Goliath, that he lay “drowned in his own blood.” An example of the second, is the case of a man, who, having slipped and fallen into a river, made light of his submersion, by saying to his friends, that he “did not mind a *little wetting*.” In such tropes, not only poetry but common conversation abounds; and to confound them with literal language, would be attributing to a writer or speaker a sense very different, if not the very opposite of what he intends.

Now, it is universally admitted, that the word *baptize*, in the commission of our Lord, and in the plain narratives of the Acts of the Apostles, is not used in a figurative sense. As Ernesti observes (p. 74), “*Laws, history, didactic works, seldom admit tropes*. Legislators in their statutes, historians in their narrations of facts, where they aim simply at the declaration of them, seldom admit tropes.” In accordance with this principle, my position relative to the meaning of the word

was thus stated in my Review (p. 9): "The main question is, whether the word used by Christ to enjoin baptism, in the last exercise of his legislation on earth, in giving that commission which is binding 'to the end of the world,' denotes a *specific* act or not. If it does not, then there is no *law* which certainly holds us to immersion. If it does, then all objections drawn from supposed difficulties, or from the greater convenience of sprinkling, are no more to be regarded as *arguments*, than those questions which skeptics sometimes ask, in order to throw discredit on the very letter and spirit of revelation."

(2.) As our authors have selected Turretin from a number of other celebrated Pædobaptist writers whom I mentioned, and have given him so prominent a place, it is evident that they regarded this quotation from him as presenting a strong case on their side. If, however, it shall appear that this entirely fails to answer their purpose, it will be but reasonable for the reader to infer that the concessions which I claimed from the other writers, are equally valid in sustaining my position.

Now why did I refer to Turretin? I spoke of him as one, who practised sprinkling as baptism. I placed his name in a list of celebrated Pædobaptist scholars. What then was my design, when, by using his name, I availed myself of his authority? It was to show, that although as a member of a church which used sprinkling, he adhered to the *practice*, it was not on the ground of the *literal* and *proper* meaning of the word *baptize*. This great point he *concedes to us*. When I spoke of Turretin, Luther and others as acquiescing in the practice of sprinkling, I implied, of course, that they had *some* reason for so doing; but my assertion was, that they did not assign the proper meaning of the word as that reason. The full advantage of this argument, they yield to the Baptists.

Let us now turn to the quotation.



[1.] In order to give his idea of the proper meaning of the word baptize, Turretin says, "Baptism is a word of Greek origin, derived from bapto, *tingere et imbuere*, and from baptizo, *intingere et immergere*." Now here, seeing that he translates bapto into Latin, by the word tingo, our authors render this merely *tinge*, and make the following remark on the whole sentence: "Turretin does not allow that bapto, the radical word, means to immerse at all, and gives baptizo another signification before that of immerse." (p. 93). That any English reader may be able to appreciate the peculiar worth of this criticism, let him take Ainsworth's English Dictionary with Latin definitions, and turn to the word Dip. He will find it thus written; Dip—*tingo, intingo, immergo*. The same words in the same order are found in other dictionaries. Tingo is given as the first Latin word to translate *Dip*. And yet my reviewers tell us that "Turretin does not allow that the radical word bapto means to *immerse at all!*" Comment is unnecessary.

In regard to Tingo, the case is this. The Latin word for Dyer is Tinctor; Tingo is a dyer's word, denoting the act of dyeing, and as that is generally done by dipping, the Latins got into the habit of using tingo to translate bapto, which means to dip. Thus Dr. Campbell (of the Presbyterian church) observes in his note on Matt. 3: 11, "the word baptize, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to immerse, and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin Fathers, by *tingere*, the term used for dyeing cloth, which was by immersion. It is always construed suitably to this meaning."

Let it be noticed however, that when Turretin mentions baptizo, the *only form of the word used in the New Testament*, to designate the rite of baptism, he speaks of it as a stronger term than bapto. This is in accordance with a remark of the celebrated Porson of Cambridge, that both words expressed immersion,



but that baptizo is the stronger word of the two. Turretin renders it not only by *immergo*, but *intingo*, which means to dip in, and is regarded by the lexicographers as denoting a complete immersion.

(2.) The first example which Turretin cites to illustrate the word, is a phrase from Plutarch,—“baptize yourself in the sea.” As my reviewers translate this instance of the word by plunge, there is no dispute as to its meaning. This then is acknowledged to be a plain case. And as this is Turretin’s first example, who can doubt about what he understood to be the proper meaning of baptize?

(3.) He proceeds to illustrate this further, by quoting a celebrated line, which Plutarch mentions in his life of Theseus, the founder of the city of Athens. It is a brief expression of the Sybil touching the fortunes of that city. The oracle compares Athens to a blown bladder floating on the water, which, though it may be pressed under the surface, will not sink to the bottom, but by its own buoyancy, will rise again when left to itself.

The line is, *Ασκος βαπτίζη, δυναι δε τιο ου θεμις εστι;* of which I gave the version of Dr. Langhorne, the English translator of Plutarch, as follows: The bladder may be dipped, but never drowned. This, Messrs. Cooke and Towne call a “loose translation,” and insist on rendering it, “Thou mayest be baptized, O bladder, but it is not permitted to thee to go under the water!” The word which Langhorne rendered dipped, is *baptizo*; that rendered drowned, is *dunai*. This line is of great importance in this discussion; (1) because it contains not the word *bapto*, which is never used in the Bible to denote the ordinance of baptism, but *baptizo*, which is always employed for this purpose; (2) because this word is so strikingly contrasted with other terms; (3.) because it has been appealed to by so many standard writers for the sake of illustration. There is no line in the Greek classics, so fitted to *decide* the question before us.

Having quoted this line, Turretin makes the following remark on the word baptize: "hence it means *more* than *epipolazein*, which is lightly to float, and *less* than *dunein*, which is to go right down, that is to go to the bottom unto destruction." Now this assertion of Turretin is directly contrary to the assertion of Messrs. Cooke and Towne, when they quoted that line in their Hints to an Inquirer. (See p. 8). There, they say, "floating upon the water is called baptism." But here, Turretin says it is not so. He says, baptism is *more* than that. On this point I agree with him. And here it is that my reviewers are found to be at variance with him whom they call "the learned and profound Turretin."

But in addition to saying that baptize means *more* than floating on the surface, he declares that it means *less* than sinking down to the bottom. The reader will observe that his expression is, it means less than *dunein*. But does he say what *dunein* means? Yes, he gives the sense of that Greek word in Latin, but his definition of it, Messrs. Cooke and Towne have covered up. He says, that *dunein* means, "to go right down; that is, to go to destruction at the bottom." His words are,—*δυνειν, quod est pessum ire, id est, ad exitium fundum petere*. This explanation, they translate, as if it meant, merely, to put under the surface;—"to overwhelm or submerge." But did they really think, that it meant no more than this? To say so, would imply that they had very little acquaintance with the language which they were professing to translate. I perceive, that in two places, they quote with respect, the dictionary of Facciolatus and Forcellinus; but in Bailey's quarto edition of that work the very phrase, *pessum ire*, stands translated for them,—"to go to perdition." And who that pretends to read Latin at all, does not know that the phrase—*ad exitium fundum petere*—means, to go to the bottom unto destruction? But in order to make Turretin appear to say, that baptism, in its proper sense, is something *less* than going under the water, they force

that very meaning, not only on the Greek word *dunein*, but on Turretin's careful explanation of it. Now, in covering up the sense of these latter expressions, which form an essential part of Turretin's criticism on the word *baptizo*, my reviewers have placed me under the necessity of saying, that, either they lack the requisite knowledge of Latin to translate this passage, or that they determined to avoid giving the full sense, or else, that they are chargeable with strange and gross inadvertence. As the last is the mildest supposition, let us try to hold to that. Perhaps they entrusted the translation to some one, who has not dealt faithfully with the author or with them. At any rate, the rendering reveals an egregious fault somewhere.

But as if wonders must come in clusters, the gentlemen refer to this point again, on page 112, and say: "We presume Mr. Hague will not stake his reputation as a scholar on the assertion that *dunai* (*δυναί*), by its own force, means to drown." If I have any reputation to risk, I may well save it for another occasion; for here, I beg the reader to observe, that the very thing which Turretin exhibits in the quotation, is the fact that *dunai* means to drown. He declares it to be the opposite of *epipolazein*, which means to swim on the *surface*, while *dunai* means to be destroyed at the *bottom*. Risk my reputation! Indeed, I need not, since I may summon others to speak. Hear BEZA, the successor of Calvin. "*Baptizo* differs from *dunai*, which signifies to plunge in the deep and to drown; as appears from that verse of an ancient oracle (he here cites the same line), in which these two terms are distinguished as expressing different ideas." Hear CASAUBON, formerly Greek Professor at Geneva, in his Annotations on Matt. 3: 6. "This was the rite of baptizing, that persons were plunged into the water, which the very word *baptizein* sufficiently declares; which, as it does not signify *δυνεῖν*, to *sink to the bottom and perish*, so doubt-

less it is not *epipolazein*, to swim on the surface. For these three words, *epipolazein*, *baptizein*, and *dunein*, are of different significations. Whence we understand, that it was not without reason that some long ago insisted on the immersion of the whole body in the ceremony of baptism; for they urge the word *βαπτίζειν*, to baptize." Hear, again, WITSIUS, Professor of Theology at Leyden (in his *Economy of the Covenants*, book 4, chap. 16, § 13). "It cannot be denied, that the native signification of the word *baptizein* and *baptizein*, is, to plunge, to dip. So that it is, doubtless, more than *epipolazein*, which is, to swim lightly on the surface; but less than *dunai*, which is, to go down to the bottom and be destroyed." Apart from these authorities, speaking directly to the point, let the reader see for himself the fact, that in Exodus 15: 10, where it is said of the hosts of Pharaoh, that "they *sank* like lead in the mighty waters," the word translated "*sank*," in the Septuagint, is this very one, of which my opponents presume that I will not venture to say that it signifies to *drown*. The ancients applied the word to the setting of the sun, from the idea that the sun sunk in the ocean. As the word means to *sink down*, when it is affirmed of a man, or of Pharaoh's army, represented as being in the water, it must leave the mind with the idea of drowning, unless something be suggested in the context or the nature of the case, to show that this natural consequence of sinking down did not occur. But in the line before us, there is an antithesis, which causes the sense of drowning, or perishing at the bottom, to be marked with more than ordinary distinctness. It is true, if I wished simply to lay stress on the idea of *covering* with water, as being involved in mere dipping, I might use the word *sink*. If a man should say to me, "to dip means only to wet," I might reply, No, in order to dip any thing, you must sink it under water. But if I should form an antithesis, and say of an urn or any vessel, "I intended to dip it,

but it sunk down," every body would understand me to mean, that the thing went to the bottom and remained there. It is thus with this Greek word. If a Greek writer means to say emphatically that baptism involves the idea of covering in water, he will express that idea strongly by the word *duno* or its compounds. But if he intends to mark the real and proper difference between baptizing and sinking down, he will do it just as the oracle has in this celebrated line, or as Turretin has done in his comments upon it.

Any reader, who will look closely at the passage, may satisfy himself, that in illustrating the proper sense of *baptizo*, Turretin's declaration amounts to this; that inasmuch as *baptizo* means more than floating *upon the surface*, and less than lying *at the bottom*, its distinctive import is, to immerse or dip,—that is, *to put under the surface*. The line which he quotes is an admirable one to exhibit the native force of the word, because there the Greeks themselves have set it forth, contrasted with other terms in such a way, as to exhibit the beauty of an exact definition.

With this illustration of the native and proper meaning of *baptizo*, Turretin *leaves that point*, and proceeds to speak of its *figurative* meanings, or the variations of the word when it is acted on by FIGURES OF SPEECH. His remark at this transition point is as follows: "But because any thing is usually merged and dipped, in order that it may be washed, and *those who are immersed are usually cleansed*, it comes to pass, that, as with the Hebrews, *tabal* (which the Seventy translate *baptizo*, in 2 Kings 5: 14) is taken for *rahatz*, which signifies to *wash*, in the same passage,—so with the Greeks, the word *baptize* is made, by means of a METALEPSIS, to signify washing. (Mark 7: 4.) The Jews, when they come from the market, except they wash (baptize) they eat not." Now in regard to this quotation, it is not necessary for me to stop here to inquire whether Mark,



in the verse referred to, speaks of complete immersions among the Pharisees, or not. I believe that he does, because he says they followed the superstitious traditions of the elders; and there is ample proof from the rabbies, that those traditions enjoined frequent immersions. But that is not now the question. What I wish to draw attention to here, is this; that if those washings were not real immersions, Turretin asserts that they came to be called *baptisms*, only by means of a figure of speech, denominated *metalepsis*. This word, it will be observed, does not appear in the translation of Messrs. Cooke and Towne. They have covered up the sense, by the word "*tropically*." But Turretin is more specific. He names the trope, by which he says *baptize* comes to be used for *washing*. He calls it a *metalepsis*. And what is this? Of all tropes, it expresses most emphatically a change produced in the meaning of a word. The very name of the trope itself signifies "*a change*." According to him, those washings mentioned in Mark, came to be called that, which, properly speaking, they were not, by means of this figure. In rhetoric, the definition of a *metalepsis* is, "*a continuation of a trope in one word, through a succession of significations*." A *metalepsis* combines several tropes in one. And if, in the view of Turretin, a partial washing was called a baptism, by means of a *metalepsis*, what two tropes could be united to produce this result? Why (1), there is a *synecdoche*, according to which a part is put for the whole; as when we speak of "*the dip of oars*," of the painter's "*dipping his pencil*," or of "*dipping a pen in ink*," when in reality we only mean the end or point. We speak thus of *dipping the finger*, when we only mean the end of it. The same thing is expressed in Luke 16: 24, without a figure, by the phrase, "*that he may dip the tip of his finger in water*." Here the same idea is expressed literally, which before was expressed by a *synecdoche*. But in Turretin's view, to form a



metalepsis, there must have been, not only this trope, by which a part is put for the whole, but he describes a metonymy,—that particular kind which the rhetoricians call a metonymy of the effect or end. In the use of this trope, the *effect* of a thing is designated by the same name as the thing itself. The effect is put for the cause. Thus, *sweat* is put for *labor*, which causes it: “in the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread.” Nevertheless, sweat and labor are different words, meaning different things. When the sons of the prophets, while eating their pottage, cried out to Elisha, *there is death in the pot*, they meant something which would *cause* death. Nevertheless, death, and a poisonous herb, are different things. Here is a metonymy.

In the case of Naaman, cited by Turretin (2 Kings 5: 14), we read that the direction was (v. 10), “Go wash thyself in Jordan seven times. And he went down and dipped himself in Jordan seven times.” As washing or cleansing is the *effect* of dipping in clean water, the act of dipping may be called, by a figure, washing or cleansing. But they are different words, *properly* meaning different things. The effect of dipping in mire, would be to *defile*, the effect of dipping in coloring matter, to *dye* or *stain*. And by a *metonymy*, each of these may be put for dipping or immersion. So too, they may be put for sprinkling, because washing, cleansing, defiling, dyeing and staining, are often the effects of sprinkling. But who would reason hence, that the word *sprinkle* means to wash, cleanse, defile, dye or stain in ANY MODE? No man, in every day affairs, would do so; yet my opponents reason thus, respecting the word translated, *dip* or immerse. Dr. Johnson defines sprinkling, to mean properly, “to scatter in drops,” and then, “to wash,—to wet.” These latter significations come into existence by means of the trope called metonymy; but he who should hence infer that all these various terms are properly *equivalent* in

meaning, that washing or wetting in *any way* is sprinkling, would seem to be making sport of the laws of language, or, if serious, would seem on common subjects "to shock all common sense."

Turretin proceeds to speak of other cases, in which rhetorical figures affect the sense of the word baptize. It might certainly be expected that the Professor of Theology at Geneva, connected with a church which practised sprinkling, would have something to say in its behalf. So indeed he has; but reader! as I quoted his authority on the *signification of the word*, be pleased to consider the fact, that Turretin does not attempt to justify sprinkling, as my opponents have done, on the ground of the *proper meaning* of baptize. His arguments are drawn from other sources. They arise from his speculations as a theologian, rather than from his principles as a philologist. They are such as we hear every day, but *in answer* to which we often plead that proper sense of the word which he fully declares. After considering the term itself, he makes a transition, to consider baptism as a *ceremony*; and for the ceremonial form of his church, he makes as fair a defence as can be made, but it does not rest on the simple meaning of the words used in the commandment of Christ. His reasons are drawn from a regard to convenience, to expediency, the difficulty of immersion in certain cases,—the fitness of sprinkling to set forth the idea of the rite, which is *cleansing*,—to exhibit the thing signified, namely, the communication of the Spirit, or the application of the blood of Christ. He speaks indeed of the word baptize being applied to what he regarded as a case of sprinkling in Mark 7: 4; but he has declared before, that in such instances, the word is changed by a rhetorical figure, and by means of a *metalepsis*, loses its original signification. As our authors say, however, that they "have not quoted him for the sake of his arguments," we need not stop to discuss them here, as

they will pass under review in their proper connections. Suffice it now to say, that while Turretin marks the broad distinction that exists between the simple, the native, the proper meaning of the word, and that *ever changing sense* which is produced by tropes and figures, he seeks to build up some defence for sprinkling from the latter; none from the former. As a classical scholar and a critic, he develops the meaning of the term with clearness and truth; as a Pædobaptist theologian, he turns to its tropical or figurative changes, to raise some support for the practice of his church. But in conceding to us the former, he concedes in this argument, all that is vital; for, as in the commission of Christ, all acknowledge that the word baptize is not used in a *figurative* sense, it must of course have there its simple and proper meaning.

My reviewers say, moreover, that they have quoted Turretin, to show how little confidence they "can place in Mr. Hague's citation of authorities," (pp. 91, 92). And perceiving, as they did, that I quoted Turretin's authority as a scholar, on the meaning of the word, and that he brings that out, chiefly in his criticism on the Sybilline verse, they add in the same breath, "He sustains our use of the Sybilline verse!" This is coming to the test. I am sorry, for *their sakes*, that they have not let this alone. As a matter of policy, it would have been wise. To their repeated declaration I reply,—if Turretin does not directly oppose their use of the Sybilline verse, and contradict their assertion, then I confess that I know nothing of the subject. Then I am altogether unable to understand his meaning, or to translate those simple and perspicuous Latin phrases in which he has expressed it. Then I am entirely incompetent to the work I have undertaken, and deserve to be pronounced so by all parties. On this question, my reviewers and I are brought at once to a definite issue, and on this, will depend very much, the estimate which

our intelligent readers will form of the worth of our assertions and citations. I am willing to abide this issue. It is a fortunate thing in a discussion to have matters brought to a point. Here, nothing that is said, can be attributed to inadvertence. My opponents have repeated their declaration, that Turretin *sustains their use of the Sybilline verse*. I have taken this as a summons to re-examine his words. If it had appeared that he really does sustain them, I could easily give him up, without injury to my cause, for, in the former reply, I just mentioned his name among those who have given immersion as the *only proper* meaning of the word baptism. His criticism on the Sybilline verse, shows whether he does so or not. And if it be true, that he understands by the word *dunai* in that verse, nothing more than what we mean by the English word dip, if his explanatory phrase "pessum ire" means simply, "to go under the water,"—if the words, "ad exitium fundum petere," denote merely a harmless submersion, from which a person or thing buoyantly rises, then I have not only mistaken Turretin, but I am so egregiously in the wrong, that I should not expect those who so understand the matter, to confide at all in my competency to investigate any perplexed moral question whatever. If, on the other hand, this Sybilline verse has the meaning which I assigned it, which Dr. Langhorne gave it in those quoted words which my opponents call a "loose translation" (in which he is sustained by those princes in sacred literature, Witsius, Beza and Casaubon), and especially, if that be the sense expressed by Turretin, then, in pertinaciously denying this, my opponents have inflicted a serious injury on their own standing as theological teachers, and as competent interpreters of the books which they read.

The **THIRD ERROR**, which the authors of the Rejoinder say they find in my reply to them, is in my claiming the authority of Luther in favor of immersion, as being

the only proper baptism. They thus express themselves, on page 93: "Mr. Hague says, page 76, that Luther asserts immersion to be the only proper mode, as the only one 'answering to the signification of baptism,' and that he so rendered the Greek word in his version of the New Testament. Now this is directly contrary to fact." Contrary to fact! Well, gentlemen, "to the law and to the testimony." The question can be easily decided. In my Review, designing to be brief, I did not quote Luther's words. Now I will do it. Let the old reformer speak for himself, and "he that *hath ears* to hear, let him hear." He says: "The term baptism is a Greek word; it may be rendered into Latin by *mersio*,—when we immerse any thing in water, that it may be *entirely covered* with water. And though that custom be quite abolished among the generality (for neither do they entirely dip children, but only sprinkle them with a little water), nevertheless, they ought to be wholly immersed, and immediately to be drawn out again; for the etymology of the word seems to require it. The Germans call baptism *tauff*, from depth, which they call *tieff*, in their language; as if it were proper those should be deeply immersed, who are baptized. And truly, if you consider what baptism signifies, you shall see *the same thing required*: for it signifies that the old man and our native character that is full of sin, entirely of flesh and blood as it is, may be overwhelmed by divine grace. *The mode of baptism, therefore, ought to answer to the signification of baptism, so that it may show forth a sign that is certain and full.*" What will our readers think of this? Truly, there is no want of perspicuity here. "He that runs may read, and the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err" in understanding such plain language as this.\*

---

\* As some may wish to compare the translation of Luther's words with the original, we give the passage in this note:

Nomen, baptismus, Graecum est; Latiné potest verti, *mersio*, cum immergi-mus aliquid in aquam ut totum tegatur aqua. Et quamvis ille nos jam aboleverit



“To make assurance doubly sure,” I will here cite a few lines, to show how the doctors of the Lutheran church understand Luther’s views of this subject. I do it the more readily, because the work from which I shall quote is easily accessible to those who wish to consult it for themselves. It is the *Biblical Theology* of two learned and orthodox German divines, Doctors Storr and Flatt, translated into English by Doctor Schmucker, Professor of Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. It was published at Andover, in 1826. In the article on baptism, it is said: “The disciples of our Lord could understand his command in no other manner, than as enjoining immersion; and that they actually did understand it so, is proved partly by those passages of Scripture which evidently allude to immersion. Acts 8: 36, &c. Rom. 6: 4. Col. 2: 12. 1 Pet. 3: 21. Moreover, the old custom of immersion was also retained a long time in the Western church, at least in the cases of those who were not indisposed. And even after aspersion had been fully introduced in a part of the Western churches, there yet remained several, who for some time adhered to the ancient custom. Under these circumstances, *it is certainly to be lamented, that LUTHER WAS NOT ABLE TO ACCOMPLISH HIS WISH WITH REGARD TO THE INTRODUCTION OF IMMERSION IN BAPTISM, as he had done in the restoration of wine in the eucharist.*”—(Vol. II, 290—291.)

But as Mr. Cooke, and his younger friend, have pronounced my statement of the case to be “directly contrary to the fact,” perhaps they will say, also, that

---

apud plerosque (neque enim totos demergunt pueros, sed tantum paucula aqua perfundent) DEBEBANT tamen prorsus immergi, et statim retrahi. Id enim etymologia nominis postulare videtur. Et Germani quoque baptismum *Tauff* vocant, a profunditate, quam *Tieff* illi sua lingua vocant, quòd profundè demergi conveniat eos, qui baptizantur. Et sanè si spectes quid baptismus significet, idem requiri videbis. Hoc enim significat ut vetus homo, et nativitas nostra plena peccatis, quae ex carne et sanguine constat, totam per divinam gratiam demergatur, id quod copiosius indicabimus. *Debebat* igitur modus baptizandi respondere significationi baptismi, et certum ac plenum ejus ederet signum.—*Opera*, tom. 1, fol. 72. *Witeberg*, 1582.—*Or Walch ed.*, vol. 10, p. 25, 93.



these Lutheran doctors and German scholars, do not understand Luther's meaning so well as they themselves do. Indeed, they are morally bound to make this out, or else to retract what they have said. If they conclude to do the latter, we shall honor them for their candor; if they attempt the former, we shall probably say no more on this point, but leave them "alone in their glory."

In order to estimate, however, the degree of intelligence which my reviewers have brought to this discussion, let us notice their explanation of the word *Taufen*, of which we have already heard Luther himself speak. They say, "The German word which Luther uses when baptism stands for the religious rite, is not the word which means to immerse, if we may place any reliance upon the two German lexicons now lying upon our table." They then quote two modern dictionaries, which give such meanings as, *to christen—to give a name*, &c. What an apt explanation is this of the sense in which Luther used the term! We all know that since his day, the German word which he used to translate baptize, has been applied in his own country to that act of christening, which, he said, was not baptism. The church in Germany being established by law, and the practice of immersion being opposed by the government, the common modes of expression have thus been modified, and modern dictionaries, we know, must give the modern and prevailing usage. But did any German scholar ever maintain that this word, in its own etymological and native sense, the sense in which Luther used it, meant merely to christen, to initiate in a church, or to give a name? Never. Such an one knows that *tauchen* [to dip] and *taufen* were originally the same. And Luther himself sets aside all question here, by the manner in which he asserts the sense of the word. How absurd a thing it is, then, instead of letting Luther

himself explain a term which he used three centuries ago, to turn to a modern dictionary, which gives only the present, every-day usage. Is this to be called exegesis, criticism—or what is it?

The FOURTH ERROR which my reviewers assign to me, is, in making the statement, that I inserted in my reply to them all the meanings of baptize given in Scapula's lexicon. They say, "*But Scapula does give other meanings.*" They mention what these are; and I will now examine their specification.

(1.) They say, "He (Scapula) tells us, that the word signifies (*εφαλος γινεσθαι*) "to be upon the sea." To this, I reply, first of all, it would be strange indeed that Scapula should utter any such absurdity, as it would be to say that baptize means "to be upon the sea!" Whoever says so, must be, I should think, quite out at sea, and "out of his latitude." The expression here referred to in Scapula, is an allusion to a passage in Euripides, cited to illustrate a certain application of the word. The meaning of the remark in the lexicon is this, that in Euripides a ship is said to dip (*baptein*), to denote its condition on the sea. A glance at the sentence cited from Euripides, will at once explain the whole matter. It occurs in *Orestes*, line 697, 8. Menelaus, speaking on the subject of the state, compares it to a ship, and takes occasion to say, that a vessel under full sail, "pressed by a violent wind, *is wont to dip*, but stands upright again, if one lessen the sail." If this be the meaning of the passage, we see what *must have been* the meaning of the lexicographer, in referring to it. And if the reader wishes the best authority in the world, to show that I have not mistaken the sense, let him refer to Major's school edition of Euripides, with Porson's notes; and there he will see a note to the line, in which the word *baptein* is rendered, "*is wont to dip!*" Whether my reviewers will admit that Porson knew any thing about this matter, I cannot say; but even if they

should not, I presume they will not entirely destroy his authority touching the sense of a line in Euripides.\*

(2.) They say, that Scapula declares that *βαπτω* means, “to draw up—to fill for drawing up.” Here, again, as in the case just mentioned, Scapula, having given the definitions of the word, is citing passages to illustrate them. I professed to give his *definitions*, not his *illustrations*. Greek literature is full of such illustrations. I merely wished to exhibit the authority of the lexicon on the meaning of the term. The remark of Scapula is, that the commentator or scholiast on Nicander, in a certain instance, explains *bapto* as being put for draw up, or fill for drawing up. This is one of those comments, which may well be called “extremely true;” a thing which any reader might have perceived, without having a scholiast to tell him. If I should say to a servant, Go, take your pitcher, dip it in the brook, and bring it here,—or, Go, dip some water from the spring,—he would not need to be informed that the word dip stands for “draw,” or “fill for drawing up.” But if I should gravely give him this information, and add, that hence, the words dip, draw, and fill, were all one in sense,—exactly synonymous,—it is very likely that he would not believe it. There are very few, whose native tongue is English, who would not know better. Either word might be used, but each has a distinct meaning. Now, this is just the case, in regard to the passage referred to in Nicander. The phrase is, *αὐτην ἀλα βαπτε*—*dip the sea-water itself*. There is a similar case in Euripides (Hec. 607): “But go, you old maid-servant, take a vessel, and DIPPING it (*βαψουσα*)

---

\* *Και ναυς γὰρ ενταθεισα προς Βιαν ποδι  
ἐβαπεν, ἔστι δ' αὖθις ἦν χαλᾶ πόδα.*—*Orestes*, 697.

In Potter's Euripides, the *idea* is given in a free translation, thus :

The gallant bark that too much swells her sails,  
Oft is o'erset; but let her pride be lowered,  
She rides secure, and glories in the gale.

bring some sea-water hither." On this, the scholiast remarks, that *βαπτειν* stands for, to "LET DOWN INTO *the water, or any liquid.*" This remark of the scholiast, like the other, is "extremely true." Every body knows that *dipping* implies to let down into the water, and to draw up out of it. But does it hence follow, that the proper signification of the word *dip*, is to let down, or to draw up, simply,—either one, or the other, or both, without involving the idea of putting a thing into a liquid? By no means. Why did not my reviewers refer their English readers to Donnegan's *Lexicon*, with *English* definitions, that they might see for themselves? There the matter is explained in a word, thus: *βαπτω*, to draw out water *by dipping a vessel into it*, to fill into another vessel. *βαπτίζω*, to dip in a vessel and draw. Here, then, the reader sees, that when Scapula refers to the remark of the scholiast, he gives *no new meaning* to the word.

(3.) The third instance of omitting a meaning is thus expressed: "He (Scapula) also gives examples under the sense of to tinge (which it is strange Mr. Hague did not see), to wit, that of painting or staining the hair, and pointing a spear with poison,—things not done by immersion." To this I reply, that I noticed these things, but noticed also, that Scapula sets them down as *things which are done by immersion*, inasmuch as these examples are brought to support the *definition* which I quoted, namely, "to dye, which is done by immersing." Any one may see this for himself, if he will take the trouble to look at the work. To illustrate the action intended, Scapula quotes under the same definition, Luke 16: 24, where it is said, "that he may *DIP* (intingat) the tip of his finger in water." How, then, can it be said that I omitted a meaning? The expression betrays, to say the least, great inattention to facts. I should not have thought of occupying so much space in exhibiting the sense given in this lexicon; but since

my reviewers have questioned my general statements, I have cheerfully embraced the opportunity to go into particulars. In this way, undoubtedly, my readers will in the end be more thoroughly satisfied that I have read the lexicons correctly, and that my testimony is sure. They will be pleased to observe, however, that in order to give all an opportunity to judge for themselves, I quoted an ENGLISH classical Greek lexicon, which Professor Stuart quotes as a standard work, which is in a small compass comparatively, and is easily accessible. It is Donnegan's; and as my reviewers have not attempted to tarnish my reports of that, by one breath of suspicion, I would ask every doubtful inquirer to consult it for himself.

Before leaving this point, I must observe, further, that the gentlemen have misquoted me, in saying that I praised Scapula as "one of the most celebrated lexicographers in Europe." This is a mistake. I praised the lexicon—not him whose name it bears; for while the book itself is a standard work, it derives its value from the labors of Stephanus, whose production Scapula unjustly appropriated to himself. If my reviewers were aware of this fact, they did a very great wrong in misquoting me: if not, the inadvertence is excusable.

The FIFTH ERROR which my reviewers assign to me, is, in saying that they "seem dissatisfied with the moderate statements of Dr. Woods and Professor Stuart." They call this "a fabrication of Mr. Hague's, entire," and remark, "we did say, that some of our writers on the subject, from a desire to show a generous and liberal spirit, have made unwarrantable concessions. The names of Messrs. Stuart and Woods, however, are not mentioned within many pages of this sentence; nor are they here referred to by even *the remotest implication*."

Nevertheless, I could not avoid the impression, on reading the sentence on "unwarrantable concessions," that these distinguished writers were referred to by less



than a *remote* implication. I have long known that they have been blamed in some quarters for allowing so much to the Baptists; and if any other writers on the same side of the question have made more liberal concessions than Professor Stuart, I should be glad to know who they are. Why did not the gentlemen tell us to whom they did refer? Published writings are public property, and there could have been no indelicacy in designating them. A little frankness, on their part, would have been better than a naked censure. The first impression of many minds will doubtless be, that the sentence quoted above was aimed at Professor Stuart. He is not far from us—he has been chief among those who have led our young ministers to avail themselves of the aids of German learning, to the introduction of which my reviewers are so bitterly opposed\*—his writings are well known in this community, and they exhibit a strong contrast to those which the Rev. Messrs. Cooke and Towne have presented to us. For instance, Professor Stuart says, after an investigation of passages, “On the whole, however, the probability seems to be in favor of the idea of *immersion*, when we argue merely from the force of the words or expressions, in themselves considered”†—and then again, after objecting to a *strict* adherence to immersion, says, “On the other hand, to maintain that sprinkling or affusion is the only mode of baptism, or the only *proper* mode, seems to me to partake of the like sectarian spirit.”‡ But my reviewers say, they “do not allow that to immerse is the primary signification of these terms,”§ declare that “immersion is one instance of departure from the simplicity of the gospel,” and that, “if by being right is meant the following of the scriptural mode, *one, by being immersed, will be sure to be wrong.*” The contrast is very marked; yet, if the gentlemen say they had *no reference* to the liberal statements of Professor

---

\* Rejoinder, p. 123. † Bib. Repos., Vol. III, p. 318. ‡ *Ib.*, 373. § Hints, p. 7.



Stuart, I will not at all insist on saying that they had, but am glad to find that those statements are to remain unimpugned, and that some others have made concessions more "unwarrantable" than his. Of course, with these latter writers, we should have little or no occasion for dispute.

The SIXTH ERROR on our reviewers' list is thus stated. "On page 80,\* Mr. Hague says, 'the writer speaks as if the Jews knew nothing of religious immersions;' and then proceeds to tell us, as if he considered us ignorant of the fact, that in legal purifications 'the people sometimes dipped themselves.' Let the reader turn back to page 9, and he will find that we recognize the fact of which Mr. Hague so gravely informs us."

We turn to page 9, and all the recognition of the fact that we find there is in these words. "In Heb. 9: 10, Paul calls the different ceremonial washings done in the tabernacle service, baptisms. Among them all, there is not an instance of immersion by the priests. In all cases where the subjects bathed, there was no official administration." If these words positively "recognize the fact," that immersions were in use among the Jews as *religious* services, I trust the reader will see some ground for my saying that I did not so understand them. I supposed them to mean, that no immersions were considered sacred, but were regarded as common acts, like those of bathing among ourselves. This impression was confirmed by the assertions on page 45, where they say of the apostles, "*they had been educated to regard sprinkling as sufficient for ceremonial purification, and from early childhood had seen the leper, and the Levites, and indeed the vessels of the temple, cleansed by sprinkling.*" Again, "if the influence of their Jewish education was not *counteracted* by some command of Christ, they baptized unquestionably by pouring or sprinkling." If, however, our

---

\* Page 31 of Gould, Kendall & Lincoln's edition.

authors intended to "recognize the fact" that *religious* immersions were practised by the Jews, I am sorry that I did not fully apprehend the force of their expressions; for I should wish their readers to understand this recognition clearly. I am glad, therefore, that they have now taken occasion to be more explicit in asserting that such immersions were habitual with that people. If they should speak of this point again, I trust they will not forget that the Jewish rule, as expressed by Maimonides (the Rabbi whom the Jews so much revered that they used to call him the lamp of Israel), runs thus: "Wheresoever, in the law, washing of flesh or of clothes is mentioned, it means nothing else than the dipping of the whole body in water; for if any man wash himself all over, except the top of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness."\*

The SEVENTH ERROR, as they call it, is worthy of particular attention. It is expressed as follows: "On page 71, Mr. Hague says, 'The principle that baptizo, *by its own force*, determines the way of applying water, is clearly set forth by those three great lexicographers of the New Testament, Schleusner, Wahl, and Bretschneider.' Astonishing! Schleusner defines baptizo, 1, to immerse in water; 2, to wash, sprinkle, or cleanse with water (*ablucio, lavo, aqua purgo*); 3, to baptize; 4, to pour out largely (*profundo largiter, &c.*) Only one of Schleusner's definitions restricts the meaning to immersion. Three of them denote the application of the fluid by affusion. Wahl defines baptizo, first, to wash, to perform ablution, to cleanse. Bretschneider's lexicon gives no ground for Mr. Hague's assertion, for he defines baptizo, to wash, to perform ablution, &c. We have never yet seen a lexicon which sustains Mr. Hague's position."

I said that this paragraph is worthy of special attention; for it contains a key to the mystery which

---

\* Lightfoot on Matt. III.

has puzzled some inquiring minds. The question before these has been,—how is it, that those who are regarded as honest and Christian men, and who profess to be able to read the lexicons, should differ outright in their reports of what the lexicons say? I answer, that in this last quotation, we have the means of explaining it. Let the reader attend, and he will mark the principle which will enable him to unravel many such difficulties. My statement is, that Schleusner develops “the principle, that baptizo, by its own force, determines the way of applying water.” This, Messrs. Cooke and Towne explicitly deny. In answering them on this point, I will do two things. First, I will quote an important explanation of Schleusner, which they have omitted; and secondly, exhibit the *process* by which they make Schleusner say that baptize means to sprinkle.

Schleusner’s definition runs thus: “Baptizo, 1, PROPERLY, to immerse and dip in, to merge in water. It answers to the Hebrew word *tabal*. Now, BECAUSE, not unfrequently, something is wont to be immersed and dipped into the water, so that it may be washed, HENCE, 2, it denotes to perform ablution, to wash, to cleanse with water.”\* Here is a very important remark. But this explanatory and restrictive sentence, which gives the *reasons why* wash and cleanse are subjoined to immerse, as meanings of baptize, was unseen by our authors, or else they regarded it as signifying just nothing at all. Otherwise, why did they omit it? It forms *a part* of the sentence from which they quoted. Schleusner says, first, that the word means properly to immerse, and then that it is used to denote washing, because immersion is a common mode of washing. But is this the same as to say, that it means to wash in any mode? No. It is saying just the reverse. It restricts the sense of

---

\* We give Schleusner’s definition in his own Latin words: *Βαπτίζω*, 1, proprie, immergo ae intingo, in aquam mergo. Respondit hebraico טבל. Jam quia hand raro aliquid immergi ae intingi in aquam solet ut lavetur, hunc, 2, abluo, lavo, aqua purgo, notat.

washing to those cases where immersion is the mode. It would have been difficult for Schleusner to express himself more guardedly. Having given the *proper* meaning of the word, his restrictive clause was designed to show, that though it may denote washing, it does, "by its own force, determine the way of applying water." Yet this clause our authors omit, and tell their readers that Schleusner says the word means to wash *in any mode!* Now I ask the reader, with his eye on that clause, to say for himself, what shall be thought of the accuracy of my reviewers, as reporters of the lexicons?

(2.) But this is not all. We must observe the *process* by which they make Schleusner say that baptize means to sprinkle. They do it thus. That Latin word, "lavo," which they quote as one of his definitions, and which properly means to wash or lave, they translate, "to sprinkle." But that Latin word is found also in the clause which they have omitted, and if their translation be correct, the whole sentence will read thus: "Now, because, not unfrequently, a thing is wont to be immersed or dipped into water, so that it may be sprinkled, hence, it means, 2, to perform ablution, sprinkle, or cleanse with water." What an absurdity to attribute to the author of a lexicon, to say that a thing is wont to be dipped into water, in order to be sprinkled! Alas, poor Schleusner! thou art to be pitied, if thou couldst speak thus, and if not, hard is thy lot to have it spoken in thy name! But the reader sees at once that no sane lexicographer ever uttered such a thing. And yet, one of two conclusions is unavoidable; *either Schleusner did say it, or else my reviewers have mistranslated him.*

But again, on what ground do they translate *lavo* (which means, wash), by the word sprinkle? The context does not demand it. No, it is directly against it. Will they say that sprinkling is a mode of washing, and therefore, inasmuch as baptism denotes

washing, it must also mean sprinkling? Yes, this is the sum and substance of their reasoning. And what is it worth? It proves too much, and therefore proves nothing. It would prove that to immerse means to sprinkle, and that to sprinkle means to immerse. Let us state the several cases more formally:

1. Baptism means washing;  
Sprinkling is a mode of washing;  
Therefore, baptism means sprinkling.

But then it is evident, also, that immersion denotes washing. My reviewers themselves say, on page 34 of their "Hints to an Inquirer," "*we* OBJECT to immersion, *because it is* A LITERAL WASHING." But when they open the lexicons which call baptism washing, they translate the word by *sprinkling!* and then proceed to say, that the lexicons are on their side! Doubtless, it is easy to bring all the authors in the world on their side, at this rate! In this way, they could show that even now, I am myself an advocate of their views, without being aware of it; for by this process, they could make it out, that the very word immerse means to sprinkle, as will appear in a second formulary like the first:

2. Immersion is washing;  
Sprinkling is washing;  
Therefore, immersion is sprinkling.

So, too, it may be said again:

3. Sprinkling means cleansing;  
Immersion means cleansing;  
Therefore, sprinkling means immersion.

Such is the amount of discrimination, of order and arrangement of meanings, which the process of our authors involves. Who that has one particle of mental independence, would not say within himself, by whatever names such interpretation may be sustained, I trample it under foot as false reasoning, I abjure it as devoid of the least glimmering of sound sense, justness or consistency.



In Johnson's dictionary, we find that wet, and wash, are given among the definitions of sprinkle. Following in the path of our authors as safe guides, we would be led to such positions as these :

4. Sprinkling means wetting;  
    Immersion means wetting;  
    Therefore, sprinkling means immersion.

Or,

5. Sprinkling means washing;  
    Immersion means washing;  
    Therefore, sprinkling means immersion.

So we might form other cases, to show that immersion and sprinkling are identical, for sprinkle is sometimes defined, to dye, color, or stain. It is true, Dr. Johnson does not say that sprinkle means to wet or wash *in any mode*, but only in a certain way. He defines the *proper* meaning of the word to be, "to scatter in drops or small masses." These other meanings come by implication, or by figures of speech. But according to our authors, this last particular is unworthy of notice, for "it is enough to say, that other meanings are other meanings, come from what source they may." (p. 97.) As the word sprinkle, therefore, means wet, wash, color, and stain, and as these acts may be performed in various modes, how obvious it is, that, according to Johnson and other lexicographers, sprinkling means, the application of water *in any way!* I know that my reviewers will recoil from this conclusion; but I know, also, that they cannot avoid it, without retracting the reasoning by which they make it out, that baptize means to sprinkle. If the reader will look closely at the subject, he may see for himself, that they must adopt this absurdity, or abandon their position. They have their choice; but if they choose to continue on the ground where they are, the sharp point of this conclusion will constantly pierce them, and render them uneasy. There is only one way of escape.



The remarks which apply to the case of Schleusner, apply equally to the other lexicographers mentioned in this connection. They all give immersion as the proper meaning of the word, and by that, all the applications of the word are modified and limited. They may cite passages where the word suggests the means of immersion, or the effect of it, but they give no meaning *inconsistent* with that primary idea. If I should say of a man, that the pouring forth of waters from a bursting reservoir immersed or overwhelmed him, would any sensible child suppose that I intended to say that to immerse means to pour? Yet there would be a case of immersion by pouring. The pouring, however, would not be the immersion, but the thing which produced it. And it might be truly said, the waters poured forth upon the man, or they overwhelmed him, or covered him, or immersed him; all these words would harmonize in their *application* to the case, though each has its own proper meaning. Such cases are pointed out by the lexicographers, when they cite passages wherein the word *baptizo* stands for pouring forth largely (profundo largiter, &c.), so as to cover any object, to inundate or overwhelm. Like instances occur in English writers. Thus, Burke says, that the Babylonian and Assyrian empires “poured out *seas* of blood.” That was a pouring which merged and buried nations,—which administered to them “a baptism of blood.” Yet, because in certain passages to “pour forth” may be interchanged with merge or bury, who would say that each word properly has the same meaning? In other passages they may develop their own force, and be set in direct contrast, as they are in that sentence of Leviticus 4: 6, 7, which I have before quoted. Unless a man understand the proper sense of words, how is it possible that he should see the true meaning of an author, or at all apprehend the beauty and strength of his expressions?

In supporting their claim to the lexicons, Messrs. Cooke and Towne observe, "Bretschneider's lexicon gives no ground for Mr. Hague's assertion, for he defines baptize, to wash, to perform ablution, &c." The fallacy of such remarks is now sufficiently apparent; but how strikingly it appears in the case of Bretschneider! He seems to desire particularly not to be misunderstood, for he says, "in the New Testament, *the word is not used*, except in relation to that appointed and sacred *submersion*, which the Jews practised in order to pledge one to a reformation of life, or to take away the guilt of his sins."\* As to Wahl, in his lexicon of the New Testament which I have consulted, he gives to *bapto*, the root, no meaning, except to dip in, to immerse. He does not even mention to dye,—the sense which Dr. Robinson says comes by implication, in Rev. 19: 13; because Wahl saw, that when we are told of a "garment dipped in blood," a child will know that dyeing or coloring is a consequence implied, without a lexicon to announce it. Under baptizo, Wahl gives no meaning or example, which is not in consistency with the proper sense of immersion. But strange to tell, my reviewers utter two things most inconsistent with each other; for they say, first, "we *object* to immersion, because it is a literal washing," and then, because Wahl says, baptize denotes washing, they exclaim,—*well, then, that expresses our view, exactly!*

The reader will see, that in replying to the remarks which occur under the head of ERROR 7, I have effectually answered those which are made under the heads, ERROR 8, 9 and 10. They repeat what has been said before, and our authors get other lexicographers on their side, in the same way they did Schleusner, Wahl and Bretschneider. It is

---

\* In N. T. non dicitur nisi de submersione solenni et sacra, que utebantur Judaei, ut vel ad vitae emendationem aliquem obstringerent, vel peccatorum eius culpam deleterent.

curious to observe, however, that, as if sorely pressed for authorities, in this case where the appeal is to *Greek* lexicographers, my reviewers quote Buck, one of their own denomination, and author of an *English* theological dictionary. Did they consider this quite apposite? I might as well have quoted the *Biblical Cyclopædia* of Jones (which is now before me, on the same shelf with Buck's dictionary), and which says, "Many writers of respectability maintain that the Greek verb *baptizo*, as well as its Hebrew synonym, sometimes denotes sprinkling; but the various passages to which they appeal, will lead every candid mind to a different conclusion." But it is not in place here to quote English dictionaries. When the point in question is the lexicography of a Greek word, we must appeal to Greek lexicons. My reviewers, however, have quoted also *Latin* dictionaries, in such a connection, as would lead one who had never seen them, to suppose they were Greek lexicons. Thus, they mention the names of Facciolatus and Forcellinus, two learned Italians, who composed a large *Latin* dictionary, in their list of lexicographers. And although these writers were members of the Romish church, which practises sprinkling or pouring, yet they do not give either of these, as meanings of the Greek word. They define it simply, immerse, wash; and if, as we have seen, Messrs. Cooke and Towne "object to immersion, *because it is a literal washing*" (p. 34), on what ground can they claim the authority of these Italians in their favor? As the name of the first of these authors is wrongly spelt, each time that it is mentioned, that fact suggests a doubt whether my reviewers have very carefully read them.

In the closing paragraph on the subject of ERRORS, the gentlemen present a list of lexicographers, whom they claim as on their side, touching the meaning of this Greek word. I doubt whether such a classification of names was ever published before, or ever

shall be again. We see the names of Greek lexicographers, known throughout the world, associated with those of compilers of Latin dictionaries, and of persons scarcely known at all. We happened to show the list to the President of a literary institution, who is much interested in the subject of lexicography. He was both astonished and amused, and inquired, "Have not Ainsworth and Cole got out of their latitude? Did Facciolatus and Forcellinus write a Greek lexicon? Did these men's names ever chance to come in juxtaposition before? I think not." What an association of *authorities*! Schleusner, Stephanus, Ainsworth, Cole, Passow, Gross!! This sort of order, or rather *disorder*, looks like chance-work; it bears not the marks of intelligent design.

The paragraph closes with the name of Schrevelius, whom it designates, "that great master and critic of the Greek tongue." Alluding to this sentence, a friend remarked to me, with some emphasis, "Here we have a key to the literary estimates of these gentlemen." Compared with some others already mentioned, "Schrevelius is notorious as a poor lexicographer." Wolf, surely a competent judge, expresses the common sentiment of Greek critics, when he says, "the Manual Lexicon of Schrevelius is not good; for he could not conjugate; he gives the forms falsely; he did not understand Greek."\* It was said in England, half a century ago, that Schrevelius's editions of ancient authors were "more elegant than correct;"† and it is observed of him in the *Encyclopædia Americana*, that he exhibited "more industry than taste or judgment." We do not mention these things because Schrevelius says any thing on the meaning of the word in question, with which we disagree, but to show the discrimination of my reviewers in estimating authors and books. We remember well, when in the days

\* Wolf's *Allerthunswissenschaft*, Vol. I, p. 193. † *Encyclopædia Britannica*.



of boyhood, Schrevelius's lexicon was our daily companion at school, for years in succession. Our teacher, in those days, obliged us to commit to memory Schrevelius's Latin definitions of Greek words, and we shall always remember, that all the renderings he gives to *baptizo* are *mergo, abluo, lavo*,—to merge, perform ablution, and to wash; but as merging is washing, we never thought that the word which means to merge, means to wash by sprinkling! We never extracted that idea from Schrevelius, nor do we believe that it ever entered into his mind.\*

Quite in keeping with their way of reporting lexicons, is our reviewers' mode of reporting other books. They publish in an emphatic manner the declaration, "Mr. Carson admits that the lexicographers are against him." But the truth is, that in regard to the point which we are now examining,—whether the lexicons give to baptize the sense of sprinkle,—Mr. Carson makes no such admission, but asserts exactly the opposite. It would seem as if my reviewers had never read Mr. Carson's work. He never read in the lexicons what they have discovered, that sprinkle is given as a meaning of *baptizo*. The great question which he is discussing is this,—whether the two words, *bapto* and *baptizo*, are "exactly the same as to signification" (*ισοδυναμια*). He speaks of those who say that they are so. He says (p. 13), "Writers in general have argued from the one word to the other, as if they perfectly corresponded in meaning." The difference he asserts to be this; that *bapto* is NEVER USED to denote the ordinance of baptism; that for this *baptizo* is ALWAYS

---

\* The manner in which my reviewers have treated this whole subject of lexicography, is very singular. The lexicons which they quote, do not sustain them. Many of their *other* authorities fail. Mr. Leigh, however, an English writer, to whom they refer, in his work entitled, "Critica Sacra," does make some remarks on the word, which are apposite to their purpose; but he quotes as *authority* Dr. Daniel Featley, a heated and violent controversialist, who wished to employ the civil power to exterminate the Baptists in England; the persecutor against whom Milton employed his pen, and who entreated "the most noble lords" that the poet "might be cut off as a pestilent Anabaptist." Yet, even Leigh acknowledges, at the close of his article, that the *proper* meaning of the word is immerse.



employed; and that while the first word often denotes dyeing, the second is NEVER used for that purpose. In regard to this *distinction*, Professor Stuart has declared that Mr. Carson has proved it incontrovertibly, and says, that from personal examination, he has come to the same conclusion. From this it would follow, that all the passages in which *bapto* is cited to illustrate the ordinance of baptism, are irrelevant, as that word is never applied to the rite. Touching the primary meaning of either word, Mr. Carson says (p. 80), "I have no quarrel with the lexicons;" and adds, "Baptist writers have always appealed with the greatest confidence to the lexicons even of Pædobaptist writers. On the contrary, their opponents often take refuge in a supposed *sacred* or scriptural use, that they may be screened from the fire of the lexicons." (p. 80.)

The fault which Mr. Carson finds with the lexicons, is in relation to their *defect*, in not marking well the difference between borrowed and figurative meanings, and those which are literal and proper. He says, "I maintain, that in figures there is no different *meaning of the word*. It is only a figurative *application*. The meaning of the word is always the same. Nor does any one need to have a figurative application explained in any other way than by giving the proper meaning of the word. When this is known, it must be a bad figure which does not contain its own light. It is useless to load lexicons with figurative applications, except as a concordance." This is the amount of Mr. Carson's criticism on the lexicons. He expressly declares, "I admit that the meaning which they take out of the word, *is always implied* in the *PASSAGE* where the word occurs. But I deny that this meaning is expressed by the word."\* Here we see that Mr. Carson's

---

\* A remark precisely in accordance with Mr. Carson's position, occurs in the preface of Richardson's Dictionary, London edition, p. 39. The writer is speaking of Dr. Johnson's want of care in not adhering more closely to the principle he had laid down, respecting the development of the proper MEANING and the conse-

accurate and discriminating mind insists on a just distinction between the proper and the borrowed, as well as figurative meanings of a word (a point, on which he has had much controversy with the Catholics)—censures the lexicons, and English dictionaries, too, for not marking it—says that the real *difference* between *bapto* and *baptizo* they have overlooked; but is this admitting that they sanction what he deems the enormous error, of saying that baptize means to sprinkle? Far from it. To what cause, then, shall it be attributed, that Messrs. Cooke and Towne have left their readers with the impression, that Mr. Carson concedes as to the lexicons, what they are endeavoring to maintain? Let the reader decide.

In summing up their remarks on the lexicons (p. 97), our authors say, "The reader is now prepared to estimate correctly the validity of Mr. Hague's claim to all the lexicographers. WE SOLEMNLY AVER, THAT NO LEXICOGRAPHER WITHIN OUR KNOWLEDGE, IN ANY COUNTRY, AGREES WITH HIM." I am sorry that they use that word "solemnly" here. It seems to indicate in the mind more heat than light, considering the occasion. What light have they given the reader, that by its aid he might be "prepared to estimate correctly" those testimonies which I presented? Strong *assertions*, frequently repeated, that those scholars whom I referred to, and many others also, define the word in question, to *sprinkle*. Why did they not include DONNEGAN in their list? Do they not know him? Did I not point him out? At Princeton and Andover, and by men of all creeds, his work has been acknowledged to be of standard character. Did they omit it, because it is in English, and easy of access? I have not now met their

---

quential APPLICATION of words, and says, "There is one general error pervading the explanations, imputable to interpreters in general, who, 'seeking the meaning of a word singly from the passages in which it is found, connect with it the meaning of some other word or words in the sentence.' This is to interpret the import of the CONTEXT, and not to explain the individual meaning of the word."

assertions by mere counter-assertions. I have exhibited to the reader the *grounds* on which I deny their statements. (1.) I have shown, that in quoting the lexicons they have omitted important explanatory clauses. (2.) That if their version of the Latin definitions is just, the lexicographer is made to utter palpable absurdity. (3.) That in claiming the lexicographer as on their side, for such a reason as they give, they contradict themselves. (4.) That the *process* by which they bring the lexicons on to their side, would prove equally well, that to sprinkle means to immerse. (5.) That their reasoning, by confounding important distinctions in defining words, could be used to prove that any Baptist writer is on their side, as easily as the lexicographers.

The grand, the fatal mistake of my reviewers in reading and reporting the lexicons, in all that they say connected with philology, is expressed in a short sentence on page 97: "It is enough to say, that other meanings are other meanings, *come from what source they may.*" This is very different from the opinion of Dr. Johnson, who considered it to be of vast importance to mark very closely different kinds of meanings, and from what sources they came. He thought that it was the great business of a lexicographer to do this. In his "Plan of an English Dictionary," he says, "In explaining the general and popular language, it seems necessary to sort the several senses of each word, and to exhibit, first, its natural and primitive signification, and then to give its *consequential* meaning." This is a principle of immense importance. We have already noticed, for instance, that "to wet" is a consequential meaning of such words as dip, swim, float, sink, immerse, pour, and sprinkle; but it is not a definition of either of them. If a man should assert that it was, should reason on it as such, saying, that it was annexed to one or all of those words in a dictionary, what would be thought of his perspicacity? If a servant, when

directed to dip his pitcher, should sprinkle water over it, and then maintain that he had obeyed the direction, because he had found in a dictionary that dip means "to wet," and therefore dip must mean to apply water *in any mode*, what would be thought of his aptness? And if his employer should patiently reason with him, and tell him that the proper meaning of *dip* is not simply "to wet," and that the proper meaning of *sprinkle* is not simply "to wet," but that those words denote *specific* acts, of which "to wet" is the consequence,—that therefore it is a meaning which only comes by *implication*,—what if he should reply, 'Well, that does not alter the case, "other meanings are other meanings, come from what source they may!"' What comment would be heard on his spirit of obedience, and on the use which he had made of his learning? Would it be said that his knowledge had aided him to explain or to *explain away* his master's commands? Would it be said that he had properly understood the dictionaries which he had read? If he would truly have understood them, in such a case, then our authors have understood the lexicons; but if otherwise, then they have misread them as egregiously as he would have done, for their mode of interpretation is precisely the same.

Having thus minutely examined their charges of error, and shown the proofs and grounds on which I pronounce them to be utterly fallacious, I proceed to consider the next most important section of their Rejoinder, which is entitled,

#### PRINCIPLES OF PHILOLOGY.

We have already been led to some development of these, but a further consideration of several points appears to be desirable. I regard this subject as important, because it involves the turning point of the controversy. If I have succeeded in this part of the argument, my success is complete; if I have



failed here, my failure is irretrievable. If the word baptize, in the commission of Christ, really means to sprinkle or to pour, there can be no argument to sustain immersion. The practice of all antiquity would not avail to set aside the supreme law; and to persist in the practice of immersion, would be rebellion against the Head of the church.

That the meaning of the word is the hinge of the question, our authors virtually declared in their "Hints to an Inquirer." In commencing that chapter entitled, "Meaning of the word Baptize," they say, "The argument for immersion is *founded* upon the assumption that the words baptism and immersion convey the same idea. But this is a great mistake." This statement of the ground of the argument for immersion is undoubtedly correct, and I proceeded to show that it was no mere "assumption" or "mistake." At the outset, I commended the author of the Hints, for narrowing the field of discussion. Many other advocates of sprinkling or pouring as baptism, have admitted all we ask touching the meaning of the word, but have pleaded for their various modes, on the ground of ancient custom, prevailing practice, or convenience; and some have insisted, that literal conformity to the primitive practice is not essential to obedience. The article of Professor Stuart, in the Biblical Repository, Vol. III, has in it much that I approve. But when he advocates the doctrine, that all modes of Christian rites may *change* with circumstances,—that, in case of necessity, the Lord's supper may be celebrated with "fish and water" (p. 367),—that "the external matters pertaining to religion" may be "modified by time and place, by manners and customs" (p. 373), then I feel obliged to express my dissent, simply on the ground, that Jesus has said, "If ye love me, keep *my commandments*." When the same author declares (p. 313), "that the PREDOMINANT usage of the words *bapto* and *baptizo* is, to designate



the idea of dipping, plunging, or overwhelming,"— "that Christians began somewhat early to *deflect* from the ancient practice of immersing" (p. 376), I am pleased with his openness and candor; but when he urges the adoption of that mode of baptism which is the most *instructive*, and says that "in the East, where bathing is so common, and where religious rites especially have required ablution, it may be more significant in some cases to *immerse*; but in the west and north, where such rites have long ceased, immersion can have no more *significancy* than affusion or sprinkling," I cannot but feel that he has turned his eye away from the true standard of practice, and substituted a varying principle of expediency for God's law and testimony. When, therefore, the authors before us seemed ready, in opening their discussion, to abide by the true meaning of the word *baptize*, and to let their cause rest on their success in showing the fundamental position of the Baptists touching that word to be a mistake, I was encouraged to write, with the hope that the controversy would soon be brought into closer quarters, and possess a character of more definiteness and certainty.

For these reasons, on opening this second pamphlet of my opponents, I was particularly desirous to see how they would dispose of the reasonings, facts, and testimonies on "the meaning of the word," which I had laid before them. I passed by other sections, to notice that entitled, *Principles of Philology*, and found that it commenced with a statement of what was called "the grand principle" of my philology. Now it is an important thing to state a fundamental principle. The perspicacity and fairness which enable one to do this well, are essential qualifications for a competent advocate of any cause. I had hoped, therefore, in this case, to see a statement which I could pronounce a just one. Instead of this, I find the following: "The grand principle

of Mr. Hague's philology seems to be this,—that if all the various meanings of a word can be traced, by any relation, *however fanciful*, to any one of those meanings, that one embraces the whole in itself." This report of the subject is about as correct as that which was once given of Paul's speech on Mars' Hill, by some philosophers who had heard it, and who said, "he *seemeth* to be a setter forth of strange gods." This strange principle was no more a part of my philology, than were the strange gods a part of Paul's theology. In both cases the reporters said, "it *seems* to be so;" but this arose from the want of close attention. Having made a definite statement of my principles, no extraordinary effort was required to discover them.

What were these principles? If the reader will turn to page 19 of my pamphlet, he will find them laid down in the words of Ernesti, quoted from Professor Stuart's translation of that writer on "the principles of interpretation." They are these:

1. "The literal meaning is not to be deserted, without reason or NECESSITY."

2. "Let not the translator commute genus for species, nor antecedent for consequent."

These canons are self-evident, and of vital importance. Neglect them, and all language is uncertain. The whole system of interpretation is "without form and void," and darkness covers the face thereof.

Let us look at these rules more closely. According to the first, the literal sense must always have precedence over the figurative. "The *literal* sense of words," says Ernesti (p. 7), "is the sense which is so connected with them, that it is *first in order*, and is spontaneously presented to the mind, as soon as the sound of the word is heard." If any one were asked the meaning of the word "*eat*," he would say, "to devour food with the mouth." But when we speak of "a man's vices *eating* up his health and money," the plainest man would see that

the word *borrowed* a meaning from the context, and that, departing by *necessity* from the literal sense, it must be understood figuratively, to mean *consume*. But if he should understand it figuratively, when the literal sense would apply, as in the phrase, "cannibals eat human flesh," he would act absurdly. Ernesti observes, again (p. 21), that "the first important distinction or division of words, in respect to their meaning, is into proper and tropical, that is, literal and figurative. A proper word is a *definite name*, given to a certain thing; a tropical (or figurative) word, is one used out of its proper, that is, original sense. And the first duty of an interpreter, in respect to tropical language, is, to rightly distinguish it from language not tropical, so as not to mistake the one for the other." In the chapter on the meaning of words, it is said: "*There can be no certainty at all in respect to the interpretation of any passage, unless a kind of necessity compels us to affix a particular sense to a word; which sense, as I have said before, must be ONE; and unless there are special reasons for a tropical meaning, it must be the LITERAL sense.*" This is the leading principle of the philology advocated in my Review,—a self-evident rule, laid down in a standard German work, and published as a text-book at Andover, years ago.

The other self-evident rule, which I have quoted from the same work, is equally important: "Let not the translator commute genus for species, nor antecedent for consequent." How remarkably my reviewers have neglected this rule, has already appeared. A striking instance of it occurred in their translation of the Latin extract from Turretin (which, however, contained the words of Vossius, adopted by Turretin), where they rendered the specific name of a figure, which is *metalepsis*, by the generic name, trope. If this mode of translation were allowed, inextricable confusion would follow. The most essential distinctions, as to the sense of

words, would be covered up. As words have various senses, it is very necessary to observe "from what sources they come." The MEANING of a word is one thing; the figurative or the consequential APPLICATION of that meaning is another thing. The consequential meaning of words comes by *implication*, but it must be distinguished from the *proper* meaning. For instance: *to consume* is a consequence of eating; the word *eat*, therefore, implies consuming. But to say a thing is consumed, does not involve, by implication, the idea of its being *eaten*. These meanings are distinct, and, as the rule says, must not be confounded. There is a vast, an essential difference, therefore, between denoting the idea of consumption, by a word that literally means consume, and one that only involves that idea by implication. Plain as this distinction is, our authors are blind to it, or, at any rate, openly deny it. Speaking of my appeal to the lexicons, they say (p. 97), "He appeals to Robinson's lexicon, as one which confines the meaning to immerse, and yet he quotes other meanings. The same is true of others named by him. Mr. Hague seeks, indeed, to evade the point, by saying that all the other meanings are figurative, or derived,\* or come by *implication*. This will be more fully answered hereafter. *It is enough to say here, that other meanings are OTHER MEANINGS, come from what source they may.*" This last sentence, as I have said, involves their fatal mistake. It is a key, to unlock what has been a mystery to some, that the reverend gentlemen should be so bold in asserting that the standard lexicons are with them. Confounding as they do, things which differ, blind to these clear and important distinctions, they trample on the plainest laws of language, without seeming to be aware of it, and draw from the lexicons what their authors never thought of inditing.

Afterwards (on p. 106), they refer to this point

---

\* The word *derived* our authors have inserted for me.



again, and furnish new proof that I was right, in saying that they did not read the lexicons correctly. They observe, "In his remarks on the several definitions given to the word *baptizo* in Robinson's lexicon, Mr. Hague says, 'That abbreviated word, *denoting by implication*, is very important in this case, and involves the principle which Mr. Towne has overlooked; and by overlooking it, he misunderstands the lexicons.'" This grave charge, which I was under the necessity of bringing against their philology, they ought to have met very fully, if they could have done it. But what is their reply? As follows: "It seems, then, that we have not yet learned to read the lexicons, because we see not how to trace all the meanings which branch off by implication, to one meaning, and make the whole family of significations attached to each word but one meaning. Upon this principle, the whole controversy is in fact made to turn." Now, any reader can see that this reply does not touch the case in hand. No, gentlemen, turn not your attention away from the real point at issue. I have not complained of any inability in you to make all meanings only one, but of your confounding figurative applications, and those senses which exist only by *implication*, with the literal meaning, placing them on the same level, reasoning from them as if they were the same thing, and saying, *no matter from what source they come!* This is my indictment, for which, certainly, there is just occasion; but, overlooking it entirely, you plead "not guilty" to another, of which I had said or thought nothing.

Here, while I write, I am constrained to pause a moment, seriously to consider the question, whether the authors of the Rejoinder never noticed such obvious principles of interpretation, as those which I have quoted. Or, if they have noticed them, have they never so felt their worth, as habitually to remember them, and apply them in practice? Have



they never, in their elementary studies, learned to distinguish between the meanings which words have as simple names of objects, and when used as tropes or figures; between meanings which are called native, proper, or literal, and those which co-exist with them simply by implication, and on that account are modified by them? Unless such distinctions be observed, it is in vain to talk of the principles of philology, or the science of interpretation; we have no better means of ascertaining with certainty the meaning of language, than have the aborigines of the forest. Lexicography can then present us with nothing but a chaos of usages, and the best lexicographers are those against whom Dr. Gregory Sharpe launches a censure, when he speaks of those "who remove the primary sense out of its place, and break that *chain* of significations, so necessary to preserve consistency, and relieve the burthen of remembrance." \*

But as our authors speak of principles of philology, it is natural to ask, on what PRINCIPLE they profess to justify their mode of interpreting words. This they intended to give us, in the following sentence: "Permit us to remind Mr. Hague, that secondary meanings shoot forth from the primary significations of almost all words—a grand characteristic of language which he seems wholly to overlook. They proceed generally from cause to effect; and it not unfrequently happens, that the primary meaning is merged or lost in some remote secondary." This sentence contains a statement of two things; first, of a *principle*, secondly, of an historical *fact*.

(1.) As to the principle, there is no dispute about its truth. I never knew it to be denied, "that secondary meanings shoot forth from the primary significations of almost all words." Every man knows it, who has thought a moment on the subject. It would be very difficult for me to "overlook this

---

\* See Preface to Richardson's Dictionary, Section II.

grand characteristic of language." The difference between the views of my opponents and my own, is not on this point, but on the importance of the question, how these "secondary meanings shoot forth." They say, *No matter how*,—no matter from what source they come. That question, they think, need not be looked at,—it may as well be covered up. I say, it is a great matter to see how they come; for if they come only by metaphor, or by some other figure of speech, or consequentially, or by implication, then they *co-exist* with the primary meaning, and are explained and limited by it.

(2.) As to the historical fact stated here, that it "not unfrequently happens, that the primary meaning is merged or *lost* in some remote secondary," that is a thing to be made out only by historical proofs, in the case of each word whereof it is asserted. My reviewers state, as a *fact*, what sometimes happens, and then reason from it, as if they had laid down a fixed and universal *principle*. This statement can avail them nothing in this discussion, unless they can prove historically, that before the gospels were written,—before the commission was given,—the primary meaning of *baptizo* had been "merged and *lost*" in some secondary. Let them do this, if they can. In that effort, they would have all the lexicons against them, without any mistake. If they should succeed, they would gain immortal honor, not merely as theologians, but as philologists; because it would be bringing to light what was unknown to Stephanus, or Schleusner, or even to *Schrevelius*.

It is quite remarkable, however, that while our authors state as a fact, that primary meanings of words are sometimes lost, they do not sustain their statement by any instance of it. If they suppose that they have done so in the case of the word *SPRING*, their mistake is very great indeed. My assertion of the modifying power of the primary

meaning, they designate “Mr. Hague’s principle of one meaning;” and say, let the reader apply it to the following sentence: “In the spring of 1840, a man by the name of Spring, made a spring over a ditch, and fell into a spring on the opposite side, and broke the spring of his watch.” This is a capital example, and I thank the reviewers for not being deterred from printing the sentence by any scruples touching its inelegance. I unite with them in asking the reader to apply to it the principle which I have exhibited,—the modifying power of the primary meaning. The word spring is of Saxon origin. The verb gives rise to the noun, and its meaning is, “*rise—arise—or raise.*”<sup>\*</sup> This meaning has various applications. 1. It denotes the *rising* up of seeds or plants from the ground; as in Joel 2: 22, “the pastures of the wilderness do spring.” Hence, it is applied as a name to that season, in which vegetation, springing forth afresh, exhibits the aspect of a general resurrection; and its primary meaning so limits it, that it could not be given as a name to that season in which vegetation decays, or that in which it lies enshrouded in its wintry tomb. 2. It denotes the *rising* up of water from the earth, and is applied as a name to a living fountain; but its primary meaning, far from being *lost*, so governs it, that it could not be applied to a stagnant body of water, a cistern, or a reservoir. 3. It may denote the *rising* up of a man from the ground, and thus may stand for the word leap, or jump; but its primary meaning so rules its application, that it cannot be made to designate a slow, horizontal motion, such, for instance, as follows from one’s being dragged or propelled along. 4. It is applied, also, to any thing elastic; that is (says Richardson), “to any thing which, when stretched or pressed, *rises* or returns again;” and its primary meaning so guides it, that while it may point out the source of motion in a watch, it cannot be made to

---

\* Richardson’s English Dictionary.

designate any other part. 5. It is used to indicate the rising of a plank from its place, or a sudden motion in a thing from its own elastic force, and hence may denote a crevice, a crack, start, or leak; but its primary meaning so rules it, that it cannot denote an aperture made by cutting, wearing, burning, or corrosion. 6. It is applied, by a metaphor, to denote a motive of conduct, which is called a "spring of action" in man; but its primary meaning still lives and reigns, sways the sceptre over it, defines the bounds of its application, commands it to designate that *which gives rise* to action, and forbids it to point out the mere consequence or the effect which follows action. 7. Lastly, the word spring may be *transferred* as a name to an individual, and so may the names of other seasons; but then, "a man's name" is not a *meaning* either of spring, summer or winter.

Now, then, I have accepted my reviewer's challenge. I have applied the general principle which I advocate, to the sentence which they have constructed for the sake of trying its strength; and what is the result? I have shown, that in no instance is the primary meaning merged or lost,—that it not only exists, but "lives in state," rules like a king over all its secondaries, and says to each, "thus far shalt thou go, and no farther." It will not allow them to forget *from what source they come*, but makes them mindful of their origin, and the limits of their power. Such philology as that of my opponents, would teach them rebellion, and urge them to throw off their allegiance; but "order is Heaven's first law," and they are bound by a sway which they cannot break. The facts of the case show that our authors' criticism is false. I lay it in the dust, where it belongs, and, passing the very test which they propose, come forth with the clearer proof that their principles of philology are erroneous.

In regard to this point, my reviewers could not do themselves a greater service than to ponder the truth



contained in the following sentence, from the preface of Richardson's English Dictionary. It directs attention to the difference between the meaning of a word, and the application of that meaning. The writer says, "While investigating the meaning and consequent usage or application of words, I have considered it a duty incumbent upon the lexicographer, to direct his view,—1st, to the etymology and literal meaning; 2d, to the metaphorical application of this meaning; 3d, to the application consequent or inferred from the literal meaning; and 4th, to the application consequent or inferred from that which is metaphorical." Again, he exhibits it as the duty of a lexicographer, to give "the intrinsic meaning of the word, and thence to trace the applications in which it has been employed." Had they duly considered this, they would have written differently from what they have in the following sentences: "For the sake of illustration, let us suppose that baptizo signified originally to immerse. As washing is sometimes *the effect* of immersing, the word might easily pass from its first specific signification, to denote simply the *effect*, and in process of time, wholly *displace the specific meaning*." Here we see, that our authors admit as a *supposition*, what Professor Stuart states as a *fact*, that the original meaning of the word is immerse. Well, if, when immerse was an adequate rendering of the word, it would naturally denote washing, because this is implied in immersion, we can see at once, that baptize may mean "wash" by implication, without the original meaning being *displaced*. The two senses would co-exist, and the one would limit the other. This supposition, then, while it intimates a loss of the original meaning among the Greeks, which cannot be proved, sets forth the original state of the word exactly as the lexicons declare it. It directs our eye to a time, before the transition was effected, when the word meant both immerse and wash, at



once,—the latter by *implication*, and modified by the former. It therefore illustrates the lexicons, which now exhibit *both* meanings, the second, however, in subordination to the *first*. The case, as here stated, touching the former condition of the two meanings, meets all the demands of the word, as it occurs in Greek writings. Why, then, should the gentlemen urge so fondly the idea of *a change*? Why so unwilling to allow the second meaning to live, unless it shall crowd the first out of existence, to occupy its place, and even when it is dead and buried, leave it no monument or epitaph, to tell the time and manner of its decease? Must Greek literature bend to the practice of our Western churches, and provide changes to correspond with our changes of times, circumstances, and habits? The condition of our architecture in this country, has suggested to some writer the thought, that as we are an *original* people, we ought to have an *original order*, neither Ionic, Doric, nor Corinthian. This might be comparatively pardonable, considering that that is a mere matter of taste; but to recast Greek literature into a modern mould, to give it a dress suited to our manners, and to make it familiar with our changes of custom,—why this would be achieving more than the mightiest scholars of the old world ever dreamed of.

So clear is the evidence in regard to the original meaning of the word baptize, that when Professor Stuart comes to speak of its meaning in the New Testament alone, he goes as far as he possibly can, in sustaining our views, without abandoning the last inch of ground, in the scriptural defence of the practice of his own church. After saying that the Greek fathers, and the Latin ones who were familiar with Greek, understood the word to mean immersion, and felt themselves sustained by the classics, he proceeds to say: "For myself, then, I cheerfully admit, that baptizo in the New Testament, when applied to the rite of baptism, does in all probability involve the

idea, that this rite was USUALLY performed by immersion, but not always."\* Here, that learned writer states the broad *rule* of scriptural baptism to be immersion. Why, then, does he provide for some *exceptions*, by the phrase, "not *always*," as opposed to "*usually*?" Simply because the cases of Cornelius, of the jailer, and the converts on the day of Pentecost,† suggest difficulties in the way of immersion. But against such a mighty array of evidence as the professor brings in favor of immersion, these supposed inconveniences are lighter than the "small dust of the balance." Actual impossibilities would determine those cases against immersion, of course; but inconveniences can effect nothing against a positive statement of inspired apostles. When we are told that Jesus went from Galilee to Jordan, to be baptized of John, we might as well let the *inconvenience* of so long a walk deter us from understanding that simple statement in its obvious sense.

Of all the words in the Greek tongue, there was never one whose history gave firmer proof of its having retained its original meaning. In the article to which I have referred, Professor Stuart says (p. 359), speaking of immersion, "I know of no one usage of ancient times, which seems to me more clearly and certainly made out." He quotes Dr. Brenner, a learned Catholic (p. 361), acknowledging this, though contrary to the practice of his own church, and says, moreover, "the mode of baptism by immersion, the Oriental church has ALWAYS continued to preserve, even down to the present time. The members of this church are accustomed to call the members of the Western churches *sprinkled Christians*, by way of ridicule and contempt. They maintain that *baptizo* can mean nothing but immerge, and that baptism by sprinkling is as great a solecism as *immersion* by *aspersion*; and they claim to themselves the honor of having preserved the ancient,

\* Bib. Rep., Vol. III, p. 362.

† Acts 10: 47, 48. 16: 32, 33. and 2: 41.

sacred rite of the church, *free from change* and from corruption, which would destroy its significancy." Reader, consider this testimony of Professor Stuart, for which he refers to the best European authorities. The Oriental church charges the Catholics with having *changed* immersion into sprinkling. The Catholics own the charge, and confess that the Oriental Christians have retained the ancient rite. Remember that these two classes of Christians are quite jealous of each other, because Orientalists will not bow to the authority of the pope; yet, in regard to the history of baptism, they both agree! There is not a single point in the evidences of Christianity better sustained. He who denies this, with his eyes open to the extent of the evidence, would be ill prepared to defend the authenticity of the Scriptures against the attacks of infidelity.

In reference to my remarks on the force of the word in question, we read (p. 108), "Mr. Hague says, that baptizo must determine the meaning by its own force, or there is no clue to the author's meaning." My remark was, that we may cite *many cases*, in which the word, by its own force, must determine the meaning of the sentence; (see my pamphlet, p. 13, or Mr. Cooke's edition, p. 71;) and then, again (p. 14), "I could fill pages with *such citations*, if it were necessary or desirable, showing that if the word does not determine mode, there is no clue to the author's meaning." What was the object of these citations? It was to ascertain the real, native force of the term, in accordance with an observation of Tholuck, that *it is one thing to give the true meaning of a word, and another thing to give a meaning which it borrows from the context*. How then shall we ascertain its own legitimate meaning, except by selecting cases where the word influences the context more than it is affected by it; where it is a principal term, and becomes the point on which the meaning of the sentence turns? For instance, in

the case which I quoted from Josephus, wherein, speaking of Jonah, he says the seamen would not throw him overboard, until the ship was about to be baptized; if one supposed that baptize properly means to sprinkle, or wash, or apply water in any mode, he would be quite at a loss to translate the sentence. He might wonder whether the pagan sailors were about to perform some religious rite, by sprinkling, or ablution, and would not have a Jew on board. Yet, if he knew enough of the manners and customs of the men to see the improbability of this, he might be disposed to doubt the veracity of his author, or charge him with uttering an absurdity. If, however, from other sources, such as the inspired writings, he had known the facts of the case, he would at once perceive, as we do, that Josephus relies on the word baptize to denote the fact of the vessel's going under water.

Sometimes we find writers, describing facts with which we are already familiar, giving certain acts a name; and thus we learn the force of words. For instance, when Homer says (Od., I, 392), "As when a smith dips or plunges (baptei) a hatchet or huge pole axe into water, viz., to harden them;" here, we are taught the literal meaning of the word as clearly as it would be done to a child, if the action were performed before his eyes, and he were taught to call it dipping. Such instances often occur; and, thus becoming possessed of the literal meaning of the word, we quickly see what is involved in it by *implication*, and learn all its applications in metaphors, and other figures. Then, when we find such a phrase as this, the ship is baptized (*βαπτεται η ναυς*), far from being left in doubt whether it means that the deck was sprinkled, or that the vessel went under water, we are led by the laws of language to take the simple, literal sense, and see at a glance that the vessel was submerged. Whether it occur in the "*fragment* of a sentence," or a "*complete sentence*,"



the rule is the same; and unless there is some proof that the author is using the word in a figurative sense, or giving it some peculiar signification, we are obliged to interpret it literally. This we will always find in the end to accord with the design of the writer; and if, in any particular case, the meaning should happen to be doubtful, the rule stated for it by Ernesti is (p. 37), that we must "regulate the interpretation of the more obscure passage by that which is more perspicuous."

But in this Rejoinder (p. 108), it is said, the *word itself* does not forbid our translating the phrase, "the ship is washed with the waves, the ship is launched," &c. There are very few men in the world, able to read Greek, who would say that; and those few are men quite warm with zeal in pressing Greek literature into the service of their church. Probably our authors would be joined in this remark by the Rev. Greville Ewing, whom they have quoted as *authority*, but touching whom, Professor Stuart says, "that Dr. Ewing should gravely proffer to the public the word *pop*, as a translation of *baptizo*, might tempt to sarcasm a graver man than Mr. Carson." In support of their assertion, however, our reviewers say, that "lexicographers tell us that the word sometimes means simply (*εφαλος γινεσθαι*) to be on the sea." This, as I have shown, is quite a mistake. What suggests it, is a remark of Scapula, made to illustrate one of his definitions. It is this: "A ship is, in a neuter sense, said to *διπ*, to denote its condition on the sea." Such language is common, now. When a ship plunges heavily, she is said to dip. I remember once to have heard a commercial gentleman, comparing two vessels with which he was acquainted. "The one," he said, "went *over* the water, the other, *through* it." The one skimmed the waves like a duck, the other *buried herself* in them. A captain of a ship once told me, that being heavily laden, and having very bad weather, he crossed the



Atlantic with his vessel *under water*. Such is the import of the phrase to which Scapula refers; and I think every reader will see, that the explanation contains internal evidence of being true. But to say that the word baptize means "to be on the sea,"—why, it would be a solecism,—a strange, uncouth expression, which even a Dean Swift could not account for.

To sustain their last remark about being on the sea, our reviewers turn for help to the case of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 5: 21), "whose dwelling was with wild asses, and who was fed with grass like oxen." They quote from the Septuagint the phrase (το σωμα αυτου εβαφη), his body was baptized. They say, "Will Mr. Hague give us the precise meaning of the Greek verb here?" I answer, certainly. May I first, however, ask them a plainer question? Once, on a voyage to Nova Scotia, a long line of fog lay before us, so thick that when the sun shone on it, it resembled somewhat a bank of snow. Into it our vessel plunged, and we could scarcely see her length. "Here we are," says one, "dipped in fog." "Yes," replies another, "thoroughly buried." Ere long we emerged into sunlight again, and it seemed like the rolling up of a curtain from before us. Will the gentlemen please to tell us the meaning of the English words "dipped" and "buried," in this instance? The use of them was most simple and natural. In a dense dew, like that which is common in the East, and to which, in the Scriptures, there is frequent allusion, there may be as real an immersion, considering that it completely surrounds and covers one, as if a man were standing on the bottom of a lake. The difference is, that in the latter case, immersion, if long continued, would be *drowning*; and in the former, the watery particles are so rare, as to allow of breathing. For a king to be driven from his palace, to pass the night with the beasts of the field, amidst cold Eastern dews, would be near akin to

dying. His suffering from the dew which enveloped him, is several times spoken of; and he would doubtless use a strong expression to denote its severity, but not *drowning*, which my reviewers seem so constantly to associate with immersion. I reply, therefore, unhesitatingly, that the phrase quoted above, means, that after being driven from his palace, where he had been surrounded with luxuries, the king's body was immersed in chilling dews. To him Milton's phrase would apply strongly,—

—“ a cold shuddering dew  
Dips me all o'er.”

But then, our version renders the phrase in question, “his body was *wet* with the dew of heaven.” Our authors add, “or sprinkled.” This last is gratuitous, and not the specific meaning of the sacred writer. If immersed in dew, he was of course *wet*; but “sprinkling” is another thing. The first is involved by implication, and limited by the literal meaning of *bapto*; the second is not in the word. This case admirably illustrates what I have said above, touching the limitation of those meanings which exist only by implication. The reviewers verify a statement which I made before, that if a foreigner were learning English, and would follow out *their principles* of interpretation, he would say, that the word *dip*, in the above line from Milton, means to “*sprinkle!*” If that meaning be given to the Greek word, in the same way it must be given to the English; and this, to such men as Johnson, Webster, and our mighty host of English lexicographers, would have been a new and remarkable discovery.

In closing their remarks on Principles of Philology, the authors state another principle, as being involved in what I have said. They present this more accurately than they did the first. Still, it needs a little modification, in order that it truly represent my

view. They say, "The principle of philology, then, involved in his assertion, is this, that words must determine their sense by THEIR OWN FORCE, or there is no clue to the author's meaning." It should be rather expressed thus: *THE NATIVE FORCE, the literal sense, of words (unborrowed from the context), must be distinctly understood, before there can be any certainty of obtaining an author's meaning.* This principle strikes at the root of their mode of interpretation. They say, "let us bring this principle to the test. Take the English word *bar*, which means, a rail thrown across a passage,—an enclosure in a tavern,—any obstruction,—an enclosure in a court,—an association of lawyers,—a line in music, &c. All these meanings attach to the word. Now read the following line, and say whether the word determines the sense by its own force :

‘Must I new *bars* to my own joys create?’”

Their position is, that there is no difficulty in getting at the author's meaning, and yet that the *force of the word* does not show which of all these meanings to select! What an extraordinary statement is this,—as it seems to me, directly in the face of self-evident truth. We admit that there is no difficulty in getting at the meaning; but it is because the mind sees instantly the true literal sense of the word *bars*, which in this line borrows no new meaning from the context. The instance admirably suits my purpose; for though new senses may have been added to the word, and many more may be added in the course of centuries, yet the *original, literal sense of the word has never been displaced.* To this, therefore, the mind always recurs first, and, if the word is not changed by the context, always adheres to it. The literal sense is the light to guide us in all new applications of the term. Without knowing this, we cannot get along. This always involves the idea of an *obstruction.* Johnson's first definition is, "a piece

of wood laid across a passage, to *hinder* entrance." 2, a bolt,—3, any obstacle. Having the literal sense, we need no dictionary to enable us to understand the *figures* which arise from it. These explain themselves.

Now suppose, that what our reviewers say has happened to the word baptism among the Greeks, had happened to the word *bars* among ourselves; that is, that the original and literal meaning had been "*displaced*" by another, and in that way "*lost*." Well, which of the other meanings shall we take to fill the place of the original, the primary meaning, which is gone, dead and buried? Suppose, then, that the "enclosure in a tavern" comes to be first in order. The word *bars* suggests that idea, as its leading meaning. As the place referred to is one of hilarity, where men generally resort, to obtain what they consider the means of enjoyment, the first thought of a reader, in looking at the line before us, would be, that by "new bars" the author meant *new aids to mirth*, and spoke of creating new means of enjoyment. This would be just the reverse of the real meaning, as we now understand it. Or suppose, in place of the old literal meaning, others which are mentioned, such as an enclosure in a court, or place of justice, or an association of lawyers, came to be enthroned. Then the first idea which the line before us would suggest, as the author's meaning, would be, must I new *means of protection* to my own joys create? Or take another case, and let a line in music come in place of the primary meaning; the reader then would at once conclude that the author meant to ask, whether he must add new *acquisitions in music* to the joys which he already possessed. Such would be the effect of destroying the literal meaning, or keeping it out of sight. The word *bars*, in the quoted line, *by its own force*, determines the sense. How do we know, without any difficulty, that it means obstacles? Sim-

ply because we know that the original, literal sense has never been lost. That has the precedence, and to violate the rule which I have quoted from Ernesti concerning it, is to turn order into confusion, and the beautiful classifications and arrangements of science, into an indiscriminate ruin.

To show this, let us make an

#### APPLICATION OF OUR ARGUMENT TO THE LORD'S SUPPER.

On the principles of philology advocated by our authors, how easy it would be to prove that our Lord enjoined no specific act in the Lord's supper, when he said of the bread, "Take, *eat*." Suppose a man should say, that like the ancient shew-bread, it was designed to be *beheld* by the people, and to be set on the table before the Lord, but not to be received into the mouth; he could defend himself by as good an argument as that which sustains "any use of water" as baptism. Like our authors, he might begin by descanting on the slight stress which the gospel lays on rites and forms. Having thus prepared the way to demand a good deal of latitude, he might proceed with a criticism on the meaning of the word *eat*, and say, "the question before us is, has this word a fixed and invariable meaning?" To this, he would answer in the negative, observing first, that words often *change* their meaning, and proceed, secondly, to show, by quotations, in what various senses the word is used, in all writings, both sacred and profane. Here he would get the lexicographers on his side, with equal ease. In Webster's dictionary, the *fourth* meaning given, is, to *enjoy*; but evidently, there are different modes of enjoyment practicable, in this case. Enjoy is a *generic* term, and leaves us at liberty to do with the bread what we may deem convenient or instructive. We may enjoy it by touching it, or beholding it, or both, without receiving it into the mouth. Besides, this would be more in accordance with the liberal genius



of the Christian dispensation, and also with the sacramental meaning of the rite. The rite itself signifies our reception of the atonement, and this is often expressed by looking or beholding. The language of the Scriptures is, "*Look* unto me, and be ye saved;" and faith is explained as *looking* unto Christ, as the Israelites *looked* for healing to the brazen serpent set upon a pole. Then, again, as a *seventh* sense, Webster states *believing* to be the Scripture meaning of the word *eat*. From all this, it must be evident, that this term "has not a fixed and invariable meaning,"—that it is used in numerous senses,—that *enjoying* the bread in any mode answers the end of the precept,—that merely *beholding* agrees with its spiritual signification,—that this bears an analogy to the manner in which the shewbread was used in divine worship of old,—that the process of eating by receiving food into the mouth is less in keeping with the "purely spiritual character" of our religion, and less adapted to the sick chamber, where a person may be too weak to obey such a command with composure and profit. He who insists that the bread must be chewed and swallowed, makes it a *carnal ordinance*; and he must prove that the word *eat* means THIS, and NOTHING ELSE, which cannot be done. So, following in the track of our authors, and enlarging on every point, with ample proofs and citations, we could make it as plain that the enacting terms, in the command to celebrate the supper, enjoin no *specific* act, as they have, that the baptismal law enjoins no *specific* use of water. The principles of reasoning are precisely the same, and accomplish as much in one case as they do in the other; and he who cannot see their fallacy, as our authors have urged them, would be prepared, if circumstances were favorable, to follow his teachers in sweeping away the Lord's supper out of the church, as they fain would the primitive baptism. History justifies me in saying, that this

last expression is no mere assertion, made for the occasion; for Romish writers have used this same sort of reasoning, to draw from Christ's words at the table a sanction for turning the supper into an *offering* unto God, and presenting the elements as a *sacrifice*, by the hands of a priest. Dr. Brett takes the verb *poio* (*ποιω*), which our Saviour used in the command, "*Do* this in remembrance of me,"—a verb used in a great many applications,—and shows, from the Greek classics, and various texts in the Greek version of the Old Testament (from which the evangelists usually quoted), that *poio* has the sense of *offering*,—presenting *an oblation to God*. He says that Dr. Hicks, in his book on the Christian priesthood (p. 58), exhibits this in a very satisfactory manner. He quotes Herodotus (lib. I, c. 132), saying, "without one of the magi, it is not lawful for them *ποιεισθαι*,—to offer a sacrifice." So, Ex. 29: 36, Thou shalt offer (*ποιησεις*) a bullock. So also, in vs. 38, 39, Lev. 4: 20, and other places, "the word is used for offering a sacrifice." Now, how shall we treat the argument of these doctors? I would treat it precisely as I have that of Messrs. Cooke and Towne. I would lay down such plain principles as I have quoted from Ernesti, on which we are obliged to act, in interpreting the language of every-day life; I would show the folly of departing from them, and call upon the Romish writers to abjure the maxims of common sense, by which they expect other people to interpret their words, when they wish to be understood, or else to abjure their false interpretations. But how would Messrs. Cooke and Towne treat these writers in an argument? Ay, "there's the rub." I doubt not, however, they would come to the same philological grounds which I now occupy, but in the meanwhile, would wish to lay these "Hints to an Inquirer" on the shelf. But what if the doctors should find it, take it down, sift it thoroughly, and use the authors' principles against

themselves? That would be "turning the tables" mightily, and I only hope that if our friends ever get into such a controversy, their antagonists will not be reminded of "the Hints," or of this Rejoinder.

Convinced as I am that the practice of sprinkling was introduced by the Latin church, *knowing* as I do that her learned historians and teachers aver that she did it by authority committed unto her, and not on the ground of scriptural precept or precedent, asserted as this is by all the Oriental church, who retain immersion, conceded as it is by the most intelligent Protestants of Western Europe, it certainly is no mere assumption, to say that sprinkling as a mode of baptism is a relic of Popery. The earliest of the Reformers knew it, for LUTHER WISHED TO RESTORE IMMERSION, BUT FAILED. I speak this with emphasis, because I have shown, that it is not I who say this, but that it is uttered by the best possible authorities. If so, this is the weak point of Protestantism. It is a token of remembrance which she has accepted from Popery. And in a close contest with the Papists, it becomes a rock on which the Protestant must fall and be broken. The signs of the times indicate that this momentous controversy will wax warm in this country; and if the younger clergy are not driven to occupy the firm ground of the Baptists, one of two things will follow. Either they will embrace Puseyism (as many are now doing), which is essentially Romanism, setting church-authority above the Bible, or else will embrace Rationalism, the opposite extreme, which sets *reason* above the Bible, and proclaims an utter indifference to all rites and ordinances. Here the Baptists stand on solid rock. They do not, in any point, admit the supremacy of the church, or the supremacy of unaided reason, but of the "BIBLE ALONE." They accept no rites except what are commanded, and they administer these in exact conformity with the enacting terms, "immerse — eat — drink." They

have in ages past resisted unto death the least *addition*, when made by law, as binding on the conscience; and on the other hand, they refuse to admit the least *diminution*. Church-authority has added, and Rationalism has diminished, but they say with the Prophet of God, "THY LAW is the truth." Remove the sanctions of divine command, and they care nothing for the ordinances themselves. They would not accept them from church authority on the ground of venerableness, nor from Rationalism on the ground of fitness, and whether civil government be the organ of the one or the other, they will not accept them from it as things of *expediency*. But when an observance bears the seal of Heaven, they place obedience among the moral duties, as springing from that love, which the spiritual and eternal law enjoins. "Here is firm footing — all is sea besides." Hence, as I see the elements gathering for a keen moral trial of every church and every system, I feel truly sorry for that Protestant ministry, which proclaims the Bible as the only rule of faith, and yet feels obliged to defend the practice which is the chief memorial of a power that early arose within the church itself, rivalling the authority of Christ, assuming his prerogatives, wresting the sceptre from his hand, and *changing* the *times, seasons, and laws* of his sovereign appointment.

Having now examined the most prominent and important parts of the Rejoinder, I proceed,

III. To review the other sections in the order of their occurrence.

#### THE INTRODUCTION

is chiefly occupied in defending the refusal of the writers to designate the Baptists by their accustomed name. I did not regard this as a matter of any importance, except as the indication of a hostile feeling, quite uncongenial with the nature of that charity which does much to "clear the mental eye," and to

sweeten the tones of controversy. It is in vain to say, that the word "Immérsers," used instead of the common appellation Baptists, does not "of its own force carry contempt with it." The same might be said of the term "sprinklers," if applied to Congregationalists, as it exactly designates their practice; but would they not regard it as an uncourteous thing in us to substitute this in common speech for the name which they have chosen? Undoubtedly, ordinary feelings of propriety would forbid it, and on the ground of courtesy, we follow usage in denominating them *Pedobaptists*, although we do not believe that such a name properly belongs to them. A pedagogue is a teacher of youth, and a Pedobaptist is a baptizer of youth. Many youth who are capable of faith and conversion, are baptized among ourselves, but, in our view, the sprinkling of infants is not *Pedobaptism*. The Greeks would call it *brephorantism*. Strictly speaking, we are Pedobaptists ourselves, as is often most touchingly shown, when we publicly dedicate to Christ those interesting youth who give evidence of having been born again, and ask for baptism from a sense of love and duty. Nevertheless, as the application of names is not the turning point of this discussion, we choose in this, to follow prevailing custom, and to make no unnecessary change.

What good can the authors before us expect to gain by the course they are pursuing in the change of denominational names? To convince us of our error? Impossible; they know that a want of courtesy does not tend to conviction. To excite amongst their own churches sectarian antipathies against us? This they may do; it is the effect most likely to follow; but whether in the end that would prove to be a real good may admit of a doubt. Over such a result the more candid and pious amongst themselves would be the chief mourners. But where piety has only a feeble influence, a common manli-



ness of character should suffice to guide one in the selection of appellatives for large bodies of men. Even to Unitarians, who differ from us in a more important point than is involved in this question, we yield the name they choose for themselves, although it implies that we do not hold the true doctrine of the divine unity. But in addressing them, we reason about the doctrine itself, not the merits of the name. When the word Congregationalist was assumed as the designation of a sect, it implied that Episcopalians and Presbyterians had not just notions of church government, yet the name was generally conceded. Nothing but a spirit of bigotry could induce an opposite course, and we should ever obey the precept, "in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men."

In their defence, the writers say of the Baptists, "so strong indeed has been their preference for immerse as a substitute for baptize, that they have found it needful to rend the Bible Society, and to procure a new translation of the inspired volume, for the single purpose of introducing their favorite word." It becomes me to admit, that, from their connection with an editor's office, my Reviewers have more means of learning the *news* of the day than I possess; but if this last statement about a new English translation be a fact, I am quite unfortunate in never having heard of it from any other source than this Rejoinder. Although extensively acquainted in my denomination, I have never heard of a council or convention of any kind being called to deliberate on such a project. The Rejoinder speaks of the "appearance of this new Bible in our city." Here I plead ignorance. If any such book is in Boston, I can only say, I have not yet had the advantage of reading or seeing a copy. Moreover, if it be here, it is a book formed by individuals without any concurrence of the denomination as such; and whoever the translators may be, they have

doubtless as good a right to publish their version, as Doddridge, Campbell, Macknight, or Professor Stuart had to publish theirs. In a free country, there can be no limitation of such works, except the want of readers and purchasers.

The reason why a large number of Baptists seceded from the American Bible Society, and formed a new association in New York, called the American and Foreign Bible Society, was the decree of the Board of Managers of the former institution, directing all missionary translators who should receive their patronage, to make the *English version* their standard, so that all denominations of evangelical Christians who use the English version, might be satisfied with the translation. The American Baptist Board of Foreign Missions had long before directed their missionaries to have *no standard except the inspired original*, and to transfer into Pagan languages no Greek or Hebrew words, which would admit of being plainly translated. In the formation of the English version, king James commanded "the old ecclesiastical words to be kept." In the formation of new versions for heathen millions, the Baptists said, "let the translator be competent, and let not his conscience be fettered." This difference caused the difficulty, and the Baptists took their position in the spirit of Christian love, declaring that the whole world ought to have the Bible "unmutilated and undisguised."

Although in the English version, important improvements might be suggested, yet since it has become venerable by age, identified with our national literature, and especially, since in this land we enjoy abundant aids to lead us to a knowledge of its meaning, the Baptists at large would doubtless prefer to let it stand as it is, than to lack the benefit of a national Bible, a book of common reference in every sanctuary and every family. But is this any reason why we should carry its imperfections into

those new versions made for millions who have never seen the Scriptures? And as to the Greek word *baptizo*, is it not a fact that the greater part of the Christians of Asia and of Africa, and nearly half of the Protestant Christians in Europe, have always used versions in which it is translated by a word signifying immerse? Is it not so rendered in the Arabic, Ethiopic, Egyptian and Armenian versions, in the old Gothic of the 4th century, and in the German, Danish, Swedish, and Dutch Bibles of modern times? It is acknowledged without controversy. With such a powerful array of precedents, why should the Baptists be blamed for not being willing to make their new translations conform to the English standard, while the Catholics are not exempt from censure for pronouncing the Latin Vulgate infallible?

After their introduction, the gentlemen proceed to speak of the "important matters in their book which I have left untouched." I proceed, therefore, to notice what they say on

#### ARGUMENTS OMITTED IN THE FORMER REPLY.

They say, "the reader will please to notice that the points of our argument which Mr. Hague has omitted, are such, that if they are conceded, the question is settled against immersion. These points are, first, our whole argument drawn from the *signification of the rite*. This argument we consider of itself decisive of the whole question; and notwithstanding what may be said on other points, while this argument remains unscathed, we hold our ground firmly against immersion."

The only reason of my devoting so large a proportion of my Review to a discussion of the meaning of the word *baptize*, was the obvious fact, that on that meaning the argument turns. If that word means what my Reviewers say it does, the question is settled, there is no law for immersion, and I need

no further reasoning to lead me to practise sprinkling. If the word has the meaning which I attribute to it, there can be no sound argument for sprinkling. If I am correct in philology, the question is virtually decided. This, I think, must be evident to my Reviewers. They had commenced the discussion by a chapter on "the meaning of the word," saying, "the argument for immersion is *founded* upon the assumption that the words baptism, and immersion, carry the same idea." On page 10, they say, "what is the conclusion? Necessarily, that these words (*bapto* and *baptizo*) have not a fixed and invariable meaning — that they do not of themselves determine any one particular way of applying a liquid." In connection with this, they had referred to the testimony of the Greeks (page 17), declaring that they do not always practise immersion, and are "against the principle that immersion is essential to baptism." In opening my Review, I commended the author for "coming to the point" "because he takes a clear and decided position, and risks his whole cause upon a single issue." There were the best of reasons, then, for my laying the chief stress on that point. But in the first notice of my Review, which a friend pointed out to me in the Puritan, it was said, "this controversy *does not*, as Mr. Hague observes, *turn upon the meaning of the word*, but upon the signification of the rite." This looked as if the gentlemen were not willing fully to trust their own arguments on the meaning of the word. If those arguments had been sound, they would have been decisive. There would have been no need of shifting their position from them to any other ground. But they are not willing to rest their cause on them. Well, let us take them at their word. They consider their argument "from the signification of the rite, decisive of the whole question." I will show that this argument is invalid, that it amounts to nothing, and that they are forced back to rest, after all, on the meaning of the word.

As the authors deem this matter so important, let us look closely at their own statement of their position. They say on page 21, "Our object is here to show, in brief, the close connection between the baptism of the Spirit, and baptism with water, and that the one is a symbol of the other. Now if baptism by water is an emblem of baptism by the Spirit, we have only to look into the Bible, and see in what way we are brought into contact with the influences of the Spirit. If we are currently represented as being put into the Spirit, or plunged into the Spirit, we concede the whole matter in question; and if, on the other hand, the Spirit is currently said to be poured out upon us, or sprinkled upon us, then you must concede that pouring or sprinkling is the more *significant* way." Having quoted several passages of Scripture, on page 22, they proceed to say, "We have thus given a few specimens, to show that the Holy Ghost is said 'to fall' upon men, to be 'poured out' upon them. And it is in reference to this subject, that God promises 'to sprinkle clean water upon us,' and that his grace shall 'come down as rain upon the mown grass and as showers which water the earth.' It is of no consequence, however, as to the point before us, whether these things are said in connection with baptism or not. They are brought simply to show in what manner the Scriptures speak of the communication of the Spirit's influences. Now, then, if the thing signified is *uniformly* represented as sprinkled or poured out upon the subject, that which signifies *it* may be pouring or sprinkling."

Now it need not take a much longer time to display the weakness of all this, than to state the argument itself. Nevertheless, I will pay it due respect, by giving it ample space.

(1.) THE ARGUMENT ASSUMES WHAT IS NOT TRUE.

(2.) BESIDES THIS ASSUMPTION, THE PRINCIPLE OF THE ARGUMENT IS FALLACIOUS.



I. The argument assumes, that the Spirit "is *uniformly* represented as sprinkled or poured out, upon the subject;" and as it is said, in order to ascertain the mode of baptism, "we have only to look into the Bible, *and see in what way we are brought into contact with the influences of the Spirit*, let us follow out this plan. If we are now on the right road, let us see where it will lead us.

1. In the first epistle to the Corinthians, 12: 13, Paul says to the church, For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to *drink into one Spirit*. Here we see that the way in which "we are brought into contact with the influences of the Spirit" is by DRINKING. This expression is in exact accordance with the words of our Lord, John 7: 37—39; "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and *drink*. This spake he of the *Spirit*, which they that believe on him should receive." See also John 4: 13—14. If, therefore, the candidate, receiving from the minister a glass of water, should drink it, that would be baptism. As the word baptize itself *does not determine mode*, we are as much at liberty to select this as any other. As it suits the *signification* of baptism so well, as it is mentioned by Paul in the above verse, in connection with the word baptize, it could not be objected to as unscriptural, and perhaps by many would be regarded as an agreeable improvement on all the modes at present practised. As it is common even now for Pedobaptists to leave the choice of mode to the subject, if any one should think of taking a cup of water as baptism, the principle here proposed would certainly warrant his doing so. In this case, we must give up the idea, that religious baptism is to be performed but once, and only with water; we are baptized with wine every time we receive the eucharist. But if a baptism of *water* is to be received but once, then to drink of a cup of water is, on this prin-

ciple of interpretation, perfectly allowable. I appeal now to the good sense of every reader of the Scriptures — Is *drinking* baptism? If it is, may it not be practised when preferred? If it is not, what shall be thought of the principle of interpretation which sanctions it?

2. In the gospel of John (20 : 22), when the risen Saviour appeared among his disciples, “he breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” Here, the bringing of the disciples “into contact with the influences of the Spirit,” is represented by BREATHING. A similar expression is found in Ezekiel 37 : 9, “Thus saith the Lord God ; Come from the four winds, O breath ; and breathe upon these slain that they may live.” This representation has doubtless much of beauty in it, for as God breathed into our first parent the breath of natural life, so he *breathes* into his new moral creation the breath of spiritual life. When the Catholic church deemed herself at liberty to choose various modes of baptism, *breathing* on the subject was connected with the ordinance as an appropriate emblem. If the mode of baptism is now to be ascertained by only looking into the Bible, to “see in what way we are brought into contact with the influences of the Spirit,” then we see presented to us here a mode remarkable for its simplicity and convenience, adapted to all times, to all places and conditions, as well to the wayside, the desert, and the sick chamber, as to the river, the pool, or the sanctuary. It can be practised at once, in all circumstances wherein men can draw the breath of life. Nothing could be more *significant* of the influences of the Spirit. It agrees exactly with the word commonly used by the church in her prayers and songs in relation to it.

“*Inspire* our souls with life divine.”

If we are at liberty to select modes of baptism, the most numerous arguments drawn from expediency

may be urged in behalf of this. To speak in the style of our authors, the *presumptive* evidence is strongly in its favor. It is true, the apostles were not so much struck with its ease and convenience as to be inclined to adopt it, — Philip and the Eunuch waited till “on their way they came to a certain water,” but then the principle of interpretation now in view allows it. Again I appeal to the conscience and judgment of the reader, while I ask, is *breathing* baptism? If it is, why should it not be practised? If it is not, what must be thought of the principle which establishes it as a scriptural mode?

3. The Holy Spirit is represented as “a mighty wind,” and the fact of the disciples being “brought into contact with the influences of the Spirit,” is represented by “*BLOWING* ;” for it is said (in Acts 2 : 2, 4), when the disciples were together, “suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting — and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost.” There may be said to be an obvious agreement between this description and that saying of Christ touching the Spirit’s influence, “the wind *bloweth* where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth ; *so is every one that is born of the Spirit.*” In accordance with this figure is that aspiration in Canticles 4 : 16, “Awake, O north wind, and come thou south, *blow* upon my garden, that the spices thereof may flow out.” Thus, too, a Christian poet prays,

————— “sweet Spirit come,  
Celestial breeze, no longer stay.”

As “contact with the Spirit’s influences” is represented by *blowing*, it follows, according to the principle in question, that blowing is *baptism*. If, therefore, a candidate were placed by the minister, where a current of strong wind could rush upon him, that

would be baptizing him in a way as truly *significant* of the coming of the Spirit, as any other suggested in the Bible. The baptismal law contained in the commission does not expressly mention water as the element; and as the word *baptizo* itself "determines nothing as to mode," but leaves us to infer the manner of baptism from the emblems of the Spirit's influence, then to place one in the way of receiving the force of "a rushing, mighty wind," would be to baptize him according to a scriptural precedent. I appeal again to the good sense of the reader, can the *blowing* of wind confer Christian baptism? With your eye on Christ's baptism and on apostolic practice, you answer, No, it cannot be. What then must be thought of the argument which involves such an idea?

4. Another way in which the Scriptures represent our being "brought into contact with the influence of the Spirit" is by ANOINTING. Under the old economy, the unction or application of oil to the person, as a sign of consecration or purifying, was highly esteemed. Hence arose the frequent and happy allusions to anointing, as a symbol of the graces of the Holy Spirit. In the 61st of Isaiah, the prophet cries, "the Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath *anointed* me to preach good tidings unto the meek." Using the same figure, Paul says (2 Cor. 2:21, 22), "Now he which establisheth us with you in Christ, and hath *anointed* us, is God, who hath also sealed us and given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts. Another apostle says to Christians at large (1 John 2:20), "Ye have an *unction from the Holy One*, and ye know all things." Anointing, having been of old a sign of purifying, is thus alluded to as expressive of the soul's contact with the Spirit's purifying influences. These are the true "oil of gladness." Corresponding to this, is the expression, familiar to every reader of the Scriptures, I will *put* my Spirit upon them.

In Numbers 11 : 17, it is said, for instance, "I will take of the Spirit that is upon thee and *put* it upon them." Now when *anointing* was an appointed sign of purifying, the manner of applying it to the person was not left indeterminate. In all the annals of the world was there never such a thing heard of, as a legislator leaving a people to infer the proper *sign*, from his expressing what he wished to be *signified*. In the commands of God, perspicuity is a distinguishing feature. In Leviticus 14 : 26, &c., it was said, "The priest shall pour of the oil into the palm of his own left hand ; and the priest shall sprinkle with his right finger some of the oil that is in his left hand seven times before the Lord. And the priest shall put of the oil that is in his hand upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot, upon the place of the blood of the trespass offering. And the rest of the oil that is in the priest's hand he shall put upon the head of him that is to be cleansed, to make an atonement for him before the Lord." Behold what clearness ! Every essential act is specified. This is the fitting style for legislation. The Jewish priest was not left in doubt about the manner of applying the holy unction. He was not told that the rite signified purifying, and that he might select any mode which he, or the subject, pleased. But if this sort of indefiniteness appears in the legislation of Christ, and we are left to infer the mode of baptism from the figures which exhibit the communication of the Spirit's influences, then we see that another way in which "we are brought into contact" with those influences is by *anointing*. The Romish church has long connected unction with baptism ; but I ask the Protestant, who has the Bible in his hands, is anointing baptism ? You unhesitatingly answer, in view of the conduct of the apostles, No ; they knew of no such ordinance, neither the churches of God, "nei-



ther came it into their mind." What, then, shall be thought of the argument that would give to an unauthorized Romish rite, as being so *significant*, the sanction of Christ?

We begin to see, now, how much was taken for granted, in that stately assumption which we find on the twenty-second page of our authors' "Hints:" "Now, then, if the thing signified is *uniformly* represented as being sprinkled or poured out upon the subject," &c. Ay,—*if* it is; but, on the other hand, if it is not, the whole argument from the signification of the rite is destroyed. The condition of the writer would then resemble that of a celebrated geologist, who, having put forth a theory, based on the facts observed in a certain section of the country, won some favor to his opinions, at the first; but when it was found out, by subsequent observers, that the *facts were not there*, the case was materially changed. The beautiful theory passed away, like "the baseless fabric of a vision."

We proceed to observe,

5th. That another way in which the Scriptures represent our being "brought into contact with the influences of the Spirit," is by *the emission of sound, or PUTTING FORTH THE VOICE*. When the prophet Elijah stood in the mount, it is said (1 Kings 19), the Lord passed by, and was manifest, not in the wind, nor the earthquake, nor the fire, but in the *still, small voice*. "When Elijah heard it, he wrapped his face in his mantle." Here, the Spirit is represented, not as water, fire, or air, but as an invisible, yet a living and audible agent. Hence, David says, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue." 2 Sam. 23: 2. The apostle John repeatedly says, "He that hath an ear to hear, let him *hear* what the Spirit *saith* unto the churches." If, now, it be true, that the figures which represent the mode of "contact with the Spirit's influences," point out the mode of baptism, then, speaking to the ear,

uttering with the voice, is baptism. If so, the baptismal formulary pronounced over a candidate would suffice, without any other action. This mode would be peculiarly adapted to all climates and conditions, on account of its ease and convenience. Somewhat in the vein of our authors, it might be added, the design of baptism is to express purification, without reference to mode; but the words of the Spirit are said to have a purifying influence,\* and, of course, to pronounce them in solemn form over a candidate, would be significant of purification. If so, it would answer the end of baptism. If my reader should see any thing absurd about this, let him consider to whom it appertains. On page twenty-second, our authors say, after having quoted a number of passages, in which sprinkling and pouring are mentioned, "It is of no consequence, however, as to the point before us, whether these things are said *in connection with baptism or not*. They are brought simply to show in what manner the Scriptures speak of the communication of the Spirit's influences." Well, sprinkling and pouring, it is said, are called baptism because they represent the communication of the Spirit's influences. But "putting forth the voice" represents the communication of the Spirit's influences. Of course, then, putting forth the voice is baptism. The principle of our authors' argument leads to such a conclusion. If the conclusion be absurd, the principle must be false.

6. Another mode in which the Scriptures represent the Spirit as communicating his influences, is by "SHINING FORTH as the light." This is strikingly expressed by Paul, 2 Cor. 4: 6; "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath *shined* into our hearts." To the Ephesians, he says, "I do not cease to make mention of you in my prayers, that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ would give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in

---

\* John 15: 3. Ps. 119: 9.

the knowledge of him, the eyes of your understanding being enlightened." Christ promised the Spirit, as the Spirit of conviction or illumination. (John 16: 8, &c.) He reveals, teaches, enlightens, quickens, sanctifies, and is called the Spirit of wisdom, understanding and knowledge, of all of which, light is a common symbol. In these aspects his abundant influences were the theme of prophets, who rejoiced to think of his "going forth being prepared as the morning," and of his filling the world with the knowledge of the truth. In the passage first quoted, Paul represents his going forth over the new creation, to be as at the beginning, when light broke forth from darkness. This emblem of the Spirit's coming is different from all the rest; and it really seems as if all the grand objects of creation were laid under contribution to illustrate the variety and extent of his influence. How, then, can it be said, that those influences are *uniformly* represented by sprinkling and pouring? The *facts* are assumed.

7. But, then, the gentlemen say (p. 21), "If we are currently represented as being put into the Spirit, or plunged into the Spirit, we concede the whole matter in question." In the Rejoinder (p. 88), they admit that those instances which I have adduced, prove "that the word baptize, in *those cases*, means to immerse. That it *often* means to immerse," they say, they "have never disputed." Well, let us look at the bearings of these remarks. It is granted, that in the cases which I quote, the word *must* have a determinate meaning,—immersion. It is granted that the word has this meaning *often*. But, then, it is evident that the meaning of a word which is clear and undisputed, which in specific instances it *MUST* have, and which occurs, not rarely, but *OFTEN*, is the *current* meaning of the word. An obvious, undisputed, necessary and frequent meaning, is the "current" meaning,—not one which *may* occur, which is doubtful and disputed. It follows, therefore, that

in those cases where men are simply said to receive a BAPTISM of the Spirit, they "are currently represented as being put into or immersed into the Spirit." The more closely the reader looks at this, the more clearly will he see, that the whole matter in question is virtually conceded, however unwittingly it may have been done.

But not on this ground, alone, will I claim the concession. Apart from the *current* meaning of baptizo, the language of Scripture touching the influences of the Spirit is often in exact accordance with this representation. When the apostle John speaks of his own state in relation to the Spirit, while in the isle of Patmos, does he say that the Spirit was *upon* him, or *in* him? No, he says, "I was *in the Spirit* on the Lord's day." Rev. 1: 10. So, also, when he saw a door opened in heaven, he says (Rev. 4: 2), "Immediately I was *in the Spirit*." He speaks also of "being carried away in the Spirit" into the wilderness, and to a high mountain (Rev. 17: 3. 21: 10); just as Ezekiel was, when, as he said, "the Spirit took me up, and I heard behind me the voice of a great rushing;" "so the Spirit lifted me up and took me away." Ezek. 7: 12, 14. 11: 24. As we are said, in a natural sense, to live and move *in* God (Acts 17: 28), who is above, beneath and around us as an all-pervading presence, so, in a spiritual sense, when we pass from death unto life, we are said to move in a new element, to "live in the Spirit," and to "walk in the Spirit." When the Spirit of life from God enters into us, to dwell in us, we are as those who enjoy the light and air of a new creation. So, John says (1 Epis. 4: 16), "He that dwelleth in love dwelleth *in* God, and God in him;" and Paul says (Rom. 8: 9), "Ye are not in the flesh, but *in the Spirit*, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." To the Galatians, he says (5: 16, 17), "Walk in the Spirit;" "if we live *in the Spirit*, let us also walk *in the Spirit*." As the mind of a man intox-

icated is figuratively said to be steeped or immersed in wine, so Paul expresses the proper extent of our subjection to the influences of the Spirit, when he says (Ephes. 5: 18), "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess, but be *filled* with the Spirit." So far is it from being true, that the Spirit is uniformly represented as being sprinkled or poured upon us, that even in one of the graces of the Spirit, we are commanded to be enveloped; for it is said, "be clothed with humility." When, on the mount of transfiguration, Peter, James and John "entered into" that bright cloud of glory which came and overshadowed them (Luke 9: 35), no doubt they were baptized in the cloud,—surrounded and covered with it; and certainly, if the influences of the Spirit may be represented as "a river of water of life," as the air of heaven, as a celestial breeze, as a "mighty wind filling the whole house," as "floods upon the dry ground," as pools filled with rain, as "a cloud of dew in the heat of harvest," how accordant it must be with the genius and style of the Scriptures, to speak of an immersion into the influences of the Spirit!

How wonderful it is, that those who profess to believe in the Spirit, as a divine and pervading presence, should find any difficulty with such expressions,—should seem not to understand them, or to feel their force. When David thought of God as the light and life of the natural creation, he cried, "Whither shall I go from thy presence, or whither shall I flee from thy Spirit?" But when men are converted, pass from the kingdom of Satan into that of Christ, "from darkness to light," from their natural state into a new moral creation, they are said to "put on the new man," to be "new creatures," and are justly regarded as being surrounded with, and enveloped in heavenly influences. Yet, so narrow are our authors' views of this subject, that they say (pp. 138, 139), "Indeed, to employ it (immersion)



in representing the effects of the Holy Spirit's operations upon the human soul, seems to be a monstrous perversion of language. Those effects are purity, joy, peace, &c. Now, it is very common to speak of being immersed in care and trouble, of being immersed in debt, of being immersed in sloth, &c. The term is frequently used to denote something *disagreeable* and *oppressive*. But who ever thinks of describing that which is pleasant and joyous by such a term? Immersed in purity—immersed in joy—immersed in peace—immersed in humility—it is barbarous phraseology!" And yet, how often do the lips of those who sing the songs of Zion utter similar expressions! Have our authors, forgotten Watts's hymns? Let them turn to the 65th hymn, book 2d.

" There shall I bathe my weary soul,  
*In seas* of heavenly rest;  
 And not a wave of trouble roll  
 Across my peaceful breast."

Many of their readers must have sung that verse, without thinking of any thing "disagreeable and oppressive." Could these critics really wish that the poet had altered his phrase, and sung of a mere *sprinkling* of heavenly rest? Then, again, have they forgotten Cowper's hymn, touching the "fountain filled with blood," in which he says,

" And sinners, *plunged* beneath that flood,  
 Lose all their guilty stains?"

If their taste regards this as "barbarous phraseology," they may well inquire whether the songs of heaven would not need equal improvement; for therein the redeemed are described as those who have "come out of great tribulation, and washed their robes, and made them white, *in the blood of the Lamb.*"

From what we have said on this point, which is regarded as "decisive of the whole question," it is abundantly evident that our authors have mistaken

the *facts* of the case,—those facts which are the basis of their reasoning. Their views are too limited. Their conclusion is founded on the assumption, that in “the communication of the Spirit’s influences,” they are “uniformly represented as sprinkled or poured out upon the subject.” (p. 22.) This assumption, we have seen, is baseless. The Scriptures contradict it. The simple statement of the fact is, that all the realms of nature are laid under contribution, to furnish emblems to illustrate the influence of the Holy Spirit, who is represented by a vast variety of figures; as a well of water springing up, as a river, a running stream, oil, air, breath, rushing wind, fire, light, dew, rain; and that in each case, the language which expresses the communication of the Spirit, corresponds with the object to which he is compared. So far is pouring from being appropriated to the communication of the Spirit’s influence, that it is often applied to the dispensation of wrath and punishment; as in Hos. 5: 10, “I will pour out my wrath like water upon them;” in Ezek. 7: 8, “Now will I shortly pour out my fury upon thee;” in chap. 22: 31, “Therefore have I poured out my indignation upon them.” In Revelation, we read of angels commissioned to pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth (16: 1); and in many other places we find the same figure employed. If, then, the facts on which the argument is built, are shown to have been falsely assumed, what becomes of the argument itself?

Then, again, our authors have overlooked the fact, that where a baptism of the Spirit is really spoken of, the pouring out of the Spirit is never called the baptism, but is antecedent to it, and in order to accomplish it. Whenever I administer baptism in the church, pouring always precedes it; it is the pouring of the water into the baptistery; but we never call that the baptism. It is only the *means* of baptism, and, however necessary, is not to be

confounded with it. Water is poured into a bath, in order to bathing; but the pouring is not the bathing. Unless the skies poured down water, we could not immerse in brooks, pools or rivers, for all would be dried up. But though the one of these is necessary to the other, the two things are not identical. On the day of pentecost, the disciples were surrounded and covered with the emblems of the Spirit; for "there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it FILLED ALL THE HOUSE," accompanied with cloven tongues, like as of fire or "lambent flame;" so that, while the event fulfilled the prediction of Joel, touching the Christian age, that the Spirit should be poured out on God's servants and handmaids, the pouring out is never called baptism, but was undoubtedly the means of that baptism, which John had promised, and for which Jesus had bidden his apostles to wait; saying (Acts 1: 5), "For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." They had received the Spirit *before* this, in their conversion and sanctification; but, that all-pervading influence, that large and extraordinary impartation, involving miraculous powers, which is called the *baptism* of the Spirit, they were led to expect as Christ's ascension-gift. And when it came, it seemed as if the Saviour had "not given his Spirit by measure" unto them. Its effects and extent could not be denoted by sprinkling or pouring water on the face, for their "whole spirit, soul and body" were bathed in the celestial influence. Pouring went before that baptism, but it was a pouring, in grandeur like that which Job speaks of, when he says (29: 6), "The rock poured out rivers;" or which Isaiah expressed, when he said of the Lord (30: 28), "His breath is as an overflowing stream." In the statement of facts, then, our authors have confounded the means with the end, the antecedent with the

consequent, and have departed from all Scripture usage, in calling pouring, baptism.

II. But I have said, that, apart from their mistaking the facts before them in the Scriptures, their principle of reasoning from the signification of the rite is entirely fallacious. This argument, which is said to be "decisive of the whole question," rests on the assumption, *that in a positive institution, which depends on the will of the lawgiver, the thing to be done is not to be learned from the TERMS OF THE LAW, but by ascertaining the moral meaning of the rite, and choosing for ourselves the most appropriate manner to express it.* For a candid inquirer, a little cool reflection will suffice to show the absurdity of such a statement. It contains a principle which is prolific of evil. It is the essential element of that Jesuitical spirit of the Popish church, which enables it to explain away, in the view of the multitude, all God's explicit commands. No religious observance that was ever enjoined in any law, human or divine, could endure for a day, if such a principle were admitted. Think of it, for a moment. The baptismal law, contained in the commission, enjoins some one particular action, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, on every Christian. I say, some *one* action, because no one contends that the same person should undergo three or four modes of baptism. But the law, instead of making the action plain, uses an enacting term, which is *uncertain, equivocal, determines nothing as to manner*, and leaves the inquirer to infer what ought to be done, from the spiritual meaning of the rite! Was ever such a law heard of before? No, never, except on the ground stated by Dr. Samuel Johnson, when he says, respecting the interpretation of law, "a man accustomed to satisfy himself with the *obvious* and *natural* meaning of a sentence, does not easily shake off his habit; but a *true bred* lawyer never contents himself with *this* sense, when there is another to be found."

I pronounce the principle of interpretation involved in this whole argument from the *signification* of the rite, to be fallacious and dangerous,

1. *Because it sets aside the words of the law of Christ, as insufficient, and not adapted to explain the will of the Lawgiver.* It says that Christ has used words which do not expound the duty enjoined; and now, when the question is before us, "what is that duty?" it says, this question "does not turn on the meaning of the word" found in the law. This is degrading the legislation of Jesus Christ, and casting a stain upon its character that would be "felt like a wound" by any human legislator. As was observed by that eminent jurist, Sir William Blackstone,\* the words of a law "are generally to be understood in their USUAL and MOST KNOWN *signification*; not so much regarding the propriety of grammar, as their general and popular use." In accordance with this, is the remark of Dr. Sherlock, in his *Preservative against Popery*,† wherein, speaking of the exposition of law, he says, "When there is no such reason as makes one sense absurd and another necessary, the law must be expounded according to the most *plain* and *obvious* signification of the words, *though it should condemn* that which we think there may be some reason for, or at least no reason against; *for otherwise it is an EASY MATTER TO EXPOUND AWAY ALL THE LAWS OF GOD.*" A principle which tends to such a result, must be false; and none that was ever broached, tends to it more directly and surely than that which is the life of the argument before us.

2. I object to it, *because it sets aside that plain law of language, which forbids us to give a figurative meaning of a word precedence over the literal and the proper.* I have stated it in the words of Ernesti; and with these agree the words of President Edwards, when reasoning against Socinianism: "In words capable of two senses, the natural and the

\* Commentaries, Vol. I, Int., Sec. II.

† Vol. II, App., p. 11.



proper is the primary, and therefore ought in the first place and chiefly to be regarded."

3. I object to it, further, that it *annihilates a positive rite of Christ*. Rejecting the very word which Christ has chosen as the exposition of his will, it seizes the *abstract idea* of which his institution is said to be an emblem, and then makes *new* rites, as emblems of that idea. Immersion is one rite, sprinkling is another, pouring is another. There is as much difference, in form and meaning, between immersion and sprinkling, as between baptism and the Lord's supper. Any abstract idea, or any spiritual truth, may be represented by various outward signs or emblems. Yet, who but God has the authority to exalt one of these into an EMBLEMATIC RITE, and make the observance of it binding on the conscience? And if he selects one, impresses on it his own seal, invests it with the dignity of an *ordinance*, and commands it to be regarded as his appointment, who has the right to set it aside, and substitute another, on the plea that it will do as well, and answer the same end?

For instance: a rent garment, a dress of sackcloth, ashes on the head, a piece of crape, or a black seal, are emblems of grief. But among us, no one of these is an *emblematic rite*. But suppose, for a moment, that clothing one's self in sackcloth had been made so by divine appointment, and that on the loss of relatives, we were commanded to observe it, as a sign of humiliation and sorrow. We would naturally expect that the obedient mourner, when he should wish to ascertain his duty, would look to the *words* of the law for direction. "The commandment is a lamp." How plain is the precept! "It giveth understanding to the simple." It says, "thou shalt clothe thyself in sackcloth." Nothing can be more lucid. But he meets with a professed interpreter of the law, who tells him of his mistake, and teaches him the principle, that the question of his

duty is not to be settled by the *words of the law*, but by the *signification of the rite*. "This rite," the teacher says, "signifies grief; but grief may be signified in various modes. Pouring or sprinkling ashes on the head, or wearing a small piece of crape, will express it equally well. Especially the former, for grief itself is often represented by *pouring*; as, in Job 16: 13, 'he poureth out my gall upon the ground;' 3: 24, 'my roarings are poured out like waters;' 30: 16, 'my soul is poured out upon me, the days of affliction have taken hold upon me.' Now, if the thing signified is represented as poured out, that which signifies it may be pouring. Besides, this is more easy, cheap and convenient than clothing in sackcloth, more adapted to all climes and conditions, to all times and seasons. It is contrary to the genius of the gospel, to lay great stress on outward rites. In respect to these commands, God is not very particular. He regards the letter less than the spirit; and as pouring ashes has the *same signification* as clothing in sackcloth, either will be a fulfilment of the command. Only let us beware of that which is most 'cumbrous and inconvenient.'" This exposition might be new to the inquirer; but, unless he were quite predisposed to surrender his judgment to that of his teacher, he could scarcely fail to see its fallacy,—that it was actually *annihilating* the rite of God's appointment, and placing another in its stead. Fallacious, however, as it may be, it is an exact illustration of the principle adopted by our authors, which leads them to confound figures of speech with emblematic rites, to base an ordinance of God upon a class of metaphors, and, instead of turning to the law, and letting the proper sense of the enacting term make known his will, to reject that law, in order to select, from a wide range of emblems, one more significant than that which his command, by its own force, enjoins. O, what a bearing has an expression of the celebrated Charnock

here! "If laws may be interpreted according to our humors, the power of the law would be more in the interpreter than the legislator."

4. I object to it, again, because it is a principle which *opens a wide scope for the vagaries of superstition*. Our authors observe, speaking of the early ages (p. 135), "It is a fact, incontrovertibly established, that on no subject did superstition so luxuriate, as upon baptism." Never was there a statement more true to history than this; and while they print the *fact* in capitals, in order to draw attention to it, let the reader mark it, that *their theory of interpretation is the very one which adequately accounts for the fact*. If, as we aver, the very words of the baptismal law determine mode, and confine us to a single act as baptism, there is no room given for superstitious fancies to breathe a moment. A clear, explicit law settles every thing, forbidding addition or diminution. But if, as the gentlemen say, the enacting term in the commission of our Lord is of *uncertain* import, if it enjoins no particular mode, if nothing in the gospel "requires the conscience to be burdened with the inquiry whether it shall be done in this way or that," if nothing is said "about a danger to be incurred, by failing to perform the simple ceremonies, precisely after a particular way" (p. 5), but if we are left to infer the manner from the *spiritual signification* of the rite,—then, indeed, is a broad and rich field open, in which *superstition may luxuriate*, to its heart's content. Reader, do you not see that from this baleful principle would naturally spring all those significant emblems, which the gentlemen enumerate as accompanying baptism in a less enlightened age and land than ours? Whence, but from this, arose the *anointing with oil*, the *signing with the sign of the cross*, *eating milk and honey*, *putting on of white garments*, and other absurd observances, which they have not noticed? Our authors' theory of baptism, and this mass of

superstitions, hold to each other the relation of cause and effect. The rite was said to signify purification, and any thing that could be a sign of purification was thought to be appropriately identified with baptism. And why not, if we are left to the *signification* of the rite, to infer the proper sign, and the Bible is not particular as to manner? Certainly, "where there is no law, there is no transgression;" and those things which our authors call "fooleries" in the ancients, were, on their own principle, mere matters of taste, and ought to be treated very gently by men who deny that there is any *clear, definite* and *binding* statute on the subject. What inconsistency, to utter such a sentiment as that, and in the same breath to denounce those, who introduced various baptismal rites, on the very ground of their *significancy*, as emblems of the blessings of the Holy Spirit! Cherishing in their own system the germ from which such fruits proceed, they ought to have large charity for those of other times, who allowed it to have its proper growth,—a natural and full development.

I proceed to notice the second "important matter," which our authors think has been unduly neglected in my Review, which is, their objections to the argument for immersion, drawn by us from

#### BURIAL WITH CHRIST IN BAPTISM.

They seem to wonder that I should have passed by their "whole chapter" on this subject, and placed the argument among the "minor points" of the discussion. But then, it is evident, that if I had shown that the word *baptize* means immersion, and nothing short of that,—if I had invalidated their arguments to the contrary, and laid down principles which apply to all such arguments,—the question was settled; the declaration of Paul, "we are buried with Christ by baptism," is in such striking correspondence with that view, as to render it clearer to the mind of an inquirer; and if the attempts to

explain away that correspondence seemed rather trifling, it was well to pass them by, in a work designed at first to touch only the main point on which the controversy turns. But as they attach much importance to their argument, let us examine it.

First of all, they endeavor to raise difficulties in the way of receiving that obvious and natural interpretation of the passages before them (Rom. 6, and Col. 2: 12), which strikes at once the eye of the plain reader, which has been acknowledged, by the best commentators of all denominations, to be an allusion to the primitive practice of immersion, and which, stated by Baptists themselves, has carried conviction to the minds of millions.

The first difficulty is this. Assuming that they have proved that the grand design of baptism is to teach purification by the Spirit's influences, it appears to them impossible that its design should also be to represent a burial. "*Both cannot be held. Purity contrasts with the corruption and filth of the grave.*"

To this, my answer is two-fold. 1st. Baptism is designed to furnish a lively representation of the *means of our salvation*, by the burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Paul brings this to view, in the passage before us: "LIKE AS CHRIST WAS RAISED UP FROM THE DEAD, by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life." That such was the design of baptism, is explicitly asserted (1 Pet. 3: 21), "the like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, by the *resurrection of Jesus Christ.*" Now, whatever else is doubtful, this end and aim of baptism is clear. No words could make it plainer. If baptism can be the memorial of only one idea, this last must be received above all others, it is so distinctly taught. Most of the passages quoted by our authors touching purification, have no reference to baptism at all; of which they are well aware, when they say (p. 22), "it is of no



consequence as to the point before us, whether these things are said in connection with baptism or not." But the passages now before us have this advantage, that their express design is to teach the meaning of the rite. And as far as the emblem points to the burial and resurrection of Christ, it involves no idea of corruption; for he, the Holy One, was not left in the grave, "*neither did his flesh see corruption.*"

2. As far as baptism sets forth our own hope of salvation by Christ, the gentlemen forget that it represents a resurrection as well as a burial. They speak as if we had remained always under the water, and see nothing but the emblematic grave. Paul speaks of more. He says we are raised up to walk IN NEWNESS OF LIFE. There is purification! We put off the *old man and put on the new man*. So, at last, when the voice of Christ shall call these bodies from their tombs, fashioned like unto his own glorious body, this corruption shall have put on incorruption, this mortal shall have put on immortality, and we shall have passed through a *purifying* process, to fit us for the bliss of heaven. Since this is the Christian's peculiar hope, which the wisest of the heathens never knew, how fitting that the initiating rite of Christianity should loudly proclaim it!

But it is said (p. 23), this difficulty being surmounted, another comes. We must prove that the passage "*refers to water baptism!*" Here we are landed into Quakerism, at once. It is as easy to get rid of all the passages about water baptism, as of this. They say, the argument of the Baptists "*rests on this assumption,—yet it is mere assumption.*" Bold and startling assertion, this, to come from such a source! Do not the gentlemen know that this idea is no peculiarity of the Baptists at all, but that most of the Pedobaptist writers, throughout the world, teach the very same? It is very strange, if they did not know it; and if they did know it, it is "*passing strange*" that they should allow themselves to speak

thus. Ay, more. Standard Pedobaptist writers generally allow that the passage refers to the primitive practice of *immersion*! I have before me the well-known commentary and notes of Dr. McKNIGHT (a Presbyterian) on the epistles, who says, in his preface to the sixth of Romans, "To show that the apostles, who taught the doctrine of justification by faith, without works, did not mean to set their disciples free from the obligations of morality, Paul observed, that in baptism, the rite of initiation into the Christian church, the baptized *person is BURIED UNDER THE WATER*, as one put to death with Christ on account of sin, in order that he may be strongly impressed with the malignity of sin, and excited to hate it, as the greatest of evils. Moreover, in the same rite, the baptized person being *raised up out of the water*, after being washed, he is thereby taught that he shall be raised from the dead with Christ, by the power of the Father, to live with him for ever in heaven." This view, McKnight, who was one of the most learned writers of the Scotch church, illustrates more fully in his paraphrase. I might quote a host of other critics, of all countries, who say the same thing; and, of course, I cannot but marvel greatly, that any intelligent man should assert this view of the passage to be *a mere assumption* of the Baptists. It would be almost as near the truth, to say that the doctrine of regeneration is an assumption of the Baptists.

3. "This difficulty being surmounted," it is said, "another comes. It is a question not so easily settled, as to what the likeness shall be. If the reader will turn to the passage, he will see that there is a comparison with death, with crucifixion, with burial, &c. Suppose we insist that baptism shall imitate the form of Christ's *death*, and not his burial (for surely the two things are very distinct), what would the Immersers say?" Why, gentlemen, we should say that you had adopted a Popish practice,

without the least scriptural warrant or authority. The Catholics have long insisted on imitating the crucifixion, and have instituted an observance for the purpose; but who hath required this at their hand? If Christ had instituted a rite to commemorate his *scourging*, we should certainly observe it. If he had instituted another, to memorialize the *manner of his death*, we should also observe that. But as he has chosen that baptism should represent only his burial and resurrection, we bow to his will. Who but he, has authority to prescribe an act of ritual worship? In the selection which he has made, we see his wisdom; for burial and resurrection imply death, but mere death does not imply burial and resurrection; and without the latter, Christ's death would have availed us nothing. The sign of the cross would have been a stigma, and not an honor.

4. "This difficulty being surmounted," we are told, "another comes. How shall we baptize in a way to imitate a burial?" We answer,—as you please, only let it be with becoming reverence, "decently and in order." It is said, "nations have various modes of burial, but in no case do they bury by thrusting the body through the soil." We answer,—the body of Christ was thrust through a small aperture into a rocky tomb, and then the entrance was closed. The body was thus COVERED, and hidden from sight. Jesus was pleased to compare his own burial to that of Jonah; "for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be in the heart of the earth." The circumstances and the manner of these two burials were very different; yet none but a caviller would fix on the points of difference, because the design of the comparison is to mark the *points of resemblance*. A cavil is not an argument; and all emblems furnish occasions for cavils of this kind, because they only fix on one or more prominent points of resemblance, beyond which they do not

apply. In the Lord's supper, the broken bread is an emblem of Christ's body broken for us; but we know that of that body "not a bone was broken." The breaking of bread has nothing in it to suggest the idea of a crucifixion; but when any ask, "What mean ye by this service?" we can tell them what the points of resemblance are. All we have to do, is to preserve the ordinance *as it was delivered unto us*; and any attempt to *improve* it would be as sacrilegious as an attempt to destroy it.

What we have said is a sufficient reply to the fifth and last "difficulty" suggested, drawn from the fact that "Christ was not buried in the common way. His body was not sunk in the ground, but merely *laid away on a shelf*, in a chamber of an excavated rock." Nevertheless, HE speaks of it as a real burial, saying of Mary's anointing, "she did it for my *burial*;" and if he wished both that and his resurrection to be commemorated in the initiating rite of his religion, no emblem could possibly be selected, more expressive than an immersion, followed by an immediate rising from the water.

Now, what do all these difficulties, in the way of the *obvious* interpretation of the passage in the sixth of Romans, amount to? Labor spent in vain. A person indisposed to examine them one by one, might be impressed by the mere show they make, when numbered, and standing together. He might take it for granted, without examination, that if some were invalid, *one* might be sound. But at the first touch, they all crumble. They are like a tract, entitled, "One hundred Arguments for the Infallibility of the Pope." A hundred cyphers in a row, amount to nothing.

#### SUBSTITUTE FOR THE COMMON INTERPRETATION.

But what is the interpretation which our authors substitute for the common one? Why, they aver, that when Paul says (Rom. 6:3), "Know ye not

that so many of you as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?" he had no reference to that baptism by which the Romans had professed faith in a risen Saviour, but used the term figuratively, to denote their reception of the Spirit's influences. Yet, nothing is more evident than that the apostle recalls to their memory some familiar *facts*, obvious to the view of an objector to Christian doctrine, and adapted to meet his cavil. The cavil is brought to view in the first verse, and is to this effect: if, as you say, Christianity teaches that we are not saved by good works, but by mere grace, the practical inference is, let us have nothing to do with good works, and grace will abound the more in our pardon. ("Let us continue in sin, that grace may abound.") The question between Paul and the objector is, whether this is a just practical inference from what had been said,—*whether this is the real teaching of Christianity*. And what, from "the drift of Paul's remarks," is his object in alluding to baptism? It is, to bring some clear proof that the practical teaching of Christianity is contrary to the objector's inference. And for this, would Paul assume that the Romans had all received the Holy Spirit from heaven, and present that as proof to an objector against the apostolic doctrine? No. He takes what was palpable and obvious to every objector, the *initiating rite of Christianity*, and appeals to its *teachings*,—appeals to the holy nature of those doctrines of which it is the emblem and memorial. This would fully meet the case. An ordinance, known to proclaim a fundamental doctrine of our religion, that Christ was "delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification," that all his disciples profess at the outset to be dead and buried to the world, and to rise up to a "newness of life," would present a most effective argument, an ocular demonstration, to the objector, that the teachings of Christianity were against the conclusion,



let us "continue in sin." The true inference, then, would be, if Christians cherish the principles professed in their baptism, they will "*reckon* themselves (v. 11) to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ their Lord."

Our authors object, that *water baptism* is inadequate to produce *such an effect as death to sin*. Very true; but the PRINCIPLES which water baptism teaches, always do, with "*absolute certainty*," produce death to sin, when they take effect upon the heart; and, therefore, none ought to be baptized, but those who, in this moral sense, have died to sin. And those who have been baptized, ought to "*reckon themselves dead indeed unto sin*." They remark, again, "it is not enough to say, such *ought to be* dead to sin;" but this is just what Paul does say; "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, so WE ALSO SHOULD WALK IN NEWNESS OF LIFE." That in the passage before us, the apostle speaks of literal baptism, is as evident as that he speaks of it any where. He compares our rising in baptism to Christ's resurrection, saying, "*Like as Christ was raised from the dead*." Was not his a *literal burial and resurrection*?

IS THE LANGUAGE LITERAL OR FIGURATIVE, IN ROM. 6 : 3 ?

The great question which our authors have seen fit to discuss, touching the passage before us, is, whether the baptism spoken of is literal or figurative. They say that a literal baptism is entirely out of view. We say that the apostle had it in view, and is setting forth its spiritual or emblematic meaning. Now, is there any rule, to aid us in determining whether language is literal or figurative? Is there any thing in the *science* of interpretation? If so, let us avail ourselves of it. In Professor Stuart's translation of Ernesti on the Principles of Interpretation (3d edit., p. 74), the following rule is laid

down for this purpose: "Words are tropical (or figurative) where the subject and predicate disagree." Where the thing spoken of in a sentence, and the thing asserted of it, are incongruous in their nature, the language must be figurative. For instance, *the fields smile, the stones cry out, the trees clap their hands, &c.* So, when men are spoken of as receiving a *baptism of the Spirit*, the language *must* be figurative, because it is impossible that the Spirit can be literally applied to a human body, by sprinkling, pouring, immersion, or any other way. But when baptism "in the river Jordan" is spoken of, or baptism in any other water, the language is known to be literal, because the subject and predicate of the sentence are *congruous* in their nature. We may say at one time, that a man is buried in sleep, in amusement, in care,—immersed in business, in study,—"dipped deeply in philosophy;" at another, that he is buried in the sea, in the ruins of a city, or in a shady grove,—without causing confusion of ideas to the plainest peasant; because the principle here stated by Ernesti, strikes the mind at once, whether it be recognized in form or not. So, too, if you speak of a man being buried by a storm of snow, by a flood of waters, or by immersion in a lake, the subject and predicate of the sentence are seen to be *congruous* in their nature, and therefore the language is *known to be literal*. But if you should speak of one being buried by a gentle sprinkling, or a slight pouring, any mere man might be excused for confessing his ignorance of what to make of such language. He would be fairly puzzled, to know whether he should call it literal or figurative. There might be no incongruity between the subject and predicate of the sentence, as to their *nature*,—the substance spoken of might be adapted to burial, as dust, or water; but how a gentle sprinkling or a slight pouring could amount to burial, would be the puzzling query. This would be the incongruity of contradic-

tion. Now, as my opponents have conceded that I have proved that the word baptize means immersion in some cases, moreover, that it *often* means immersion,, and as between immersion and burying there is no *incongruity*, they must admit, in view of the rule just cited, that when Paul speaks of being *buried* by and in *baptism*, either that he refers to literal immersion, or utters a literal contradiction.

Keeping in mind the rule just mentioned, we proceed to observe, that when Paul (in Col. 2: 11) speaks of "circumcision made without hands," he evidently uses figurative language; for circumcision, the subject spoken of, and the thing predicated of it, "made without hands," present ideas incongruous in their nature. To interpret that language literally, would be to assert an impossibility, a contradiction. But when, in the next verse (12th), the apostle speaks of a burial performed by baptism (which "*often*" means immersion), the two ideas are congruous, and the language must be literal. To this, our authors suggest (p. 27), that the Colossians, in their baptism, "*had risen through faith* of the operation of God. *Yet persons immersed do not rise by faith.*" Yes, in our baptism, all our fellowship of spirit, all our sympathy of feeling, with Jesus in the design of his baptism, is *by faith*; and this is the apostle's idea, for he says, ye are "buried WITH HIM in baptism, wherein ye are risen WITH HIM, through faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead." He pursues the thought in the third chapter, saying, "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God." As it is in the Lord's supper, we literally eat bread and drink wine, this is not by faith. But our communion *with Christ* and the church in those acts, is by faith; for, "the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the *communion* of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" In that holy feast, we do spiritually, by faith, "open

the door," and he comes in to sup with us, and we with him.

The fact that this figurative circumcision is spoken of in the verse preceding that wherein baptism is mentioned, is no proof at all that the latter is figurative. For in the seventh verse of the same chapter, we have figurative and literal language in the closest possible connection: "Rooted and built up in him, and established in the faith." We see it also in connection with baptism, in Acts 22: 16; "Arise and be baptized, and *wash away thy sins*, calling on the name of the Lord."

Another important rule, stated by Ernesti in connection with this subject (p. 77), is entitled, "*Method of determining whether a trope is adequately understood.*" He says, "It is one proof that you understand tropical language, if you can substitute *proper* words for *tropical* ones. Not that a person who can do this always understands the words; but if he cannot do it, he certainly does *not* understand them." If, then, in the passages before us, baptism be used only in a figurative sense, let our authors substitute their favorite *literal* words for it, and see how apposite they would be: '*Therefore we are buried with him by sprinkling into death—buried with him in sprinkling—buried with him by pouring*, wherein ye also are risen with him—*buried with him by purification.*' Really, this would be verifying Paul's supposition addressed to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 14: 11), "If I know not the meaning of the voice, he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me." But substitute immersion, and all is lucid: '*buried with him by immersion into death—buried with him in immersion*, wherein ye also are risen with him.' "Planted together (by immersion) in the LIKENESS of his death," &c. On this last verse, McKNIGHT beautifully observes, "The burying of Christ and of believers, first in the water of baptism, and afterwards in the earth, is fitly enough compared to the

planting of seeds in the earth, because the effect in both cases is a reviviscence to a state of greater perfection."

We might apply the same rule to Peter's declaration (1 Pet. 3: 21), touching the meaning of the figure by which baptism represents our salvation: "The like FIGURE, whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, by the RESURRECTION of Jesus Christ." Can sprinkling or pouring be the *figure* of a resurrection?

Evident as it is, that the common and obvious interpretation of these passages which speak of burial with Christ in baptism, is not an error, it is interesting to see how gravely the gentlemen proceed to exhibit the "sources" of what they call "the Immersers' error touching them." Here, they chiefly repeat what they have said before. One suggestion, however, at this point, seems quite original. That is, that "the first source of error is the *imagination*." The Immerser "*fancies* some analogy between immersion and Christ's burial." Now, this remark exhibits "the source" of our friends' failure in their argument. The meaning of these passages lies low and level to the eye of common sense; but they have followed out their plan of shooting high, as at "an airy fancy on the wing," and so have gone quite over the heads of plain readers of the Scriptures. But what is very remarkable, is, that the gentlemen did not know, or have forgotten the fact, that this *fancy* has nestled in the heads of most of the standard Pedobaptist writers, in every age. Men who have practised sprinkling, have freely testified, as scholars and interpreters, that these passages took their rise in the primitive practice of immersion. McKNIGHT, whom I have quoted, alludes to Beza, who certainly teaches this, in the most explicit manner. Grotius, of the Dutch church, says on these passages, "Not only the word baptism, but the very form of it, intimates this. For an immersion



of the whole body in water, so that it is no longer beheld, bears an image of that burial which is given to the dead. There was in baptism, as *administered in former times*, an image both of a burial and a resurrection." Dr. Hammond, of the Church of England, says, on Rom. 6: 3, "It is a thing that every Christian knows, that the immersion in baptism refers to the death of Christ; the putting the person into the water, denotes and proclaims the death and burial of Christ." Burkitt says, on the same passage, "The apostle alludes, *no doubt*, to the ancient manner and way of baptizing persons in those hot countries, which was by immersion, or putting them under the water for a time, and then raising them up again out of the water; which rite had also a mystical signification, representing the burial of our old man, sin in us, and our resurrection to newness of life." Precisely the same idea is stated by Witsius, Whitby, Bishop Patrick, Bishop Taylor, and Bishop Hoadly, the last of whom has used language fully as strong as I could wish to command, saying of the times of the apostles, "*If baptism had been then performed as it is now amongst us, we should never have so much as heard of this form of expression, of dying and rising again in this rite.*" (See Hoadly's Works, Vol. III, p. 890.)

Why should I go on to quote these, and a host of others, more largely? They all unite in the same view of these texts. Those quotations which I have made, though brief, are of so decisive a character, as to show for themselves that they do not misrepresent the opinions of their authors. And in what a pitiful plight do they place the assertion, that this view is a mere *fancy* and a peculiar error of the Baptists. How clearly do they show, that if the Baptists err, they err with the learning of the world on their side; and that if the leading writers of various churches and different ages practised sprinkling, it was not at the sacrifice of scholarship and candor.

Among "important matters omitted," our authors place next in order their PRESUMPTIVE ARGUMENTS against immersion. But why should I notice these? If the baptismal law is clear and explicit, these have no force against it; and if that law is not explicit and determinate, our liberty to do as we please, touching baptism, follows of course, without any such array of reasons. Suppose a Papist should present to me presumptive arguments in favor of withholding the wine from the people in the eucharist, drawn from convenience, cheapness, simplicity, sobriety, indifference of outward forms, the superior decency of the priest taking the cup alone in behalf of the people, instead of passing it from lip to lip,—would I answer these in detail? It would be useless. I would bring to bear upon him the plain command, "Drink ye *all* of it." If he should trample on this, and continue to urge his presumptive arguments, I would only adopt the psalmist's prayer, "Lord, keep back thy servant from presumptuous sins."

As to the remarks (p. 86) on my omitting to notice the suggestions touching "the degree of certainty" which my cause demands, I cannot see any occasion for them. It is evident, from my Review, that I took the ground that the Scriptures set forth immersion as the only apostolic baptism, with as much *certainty* as any subject can be exhibited by means of words as signs of ideas.

In regard to the section on page 87 of the Rejoinder, designed to give a general statement of what I have *attempted to prove*, sufficient has been said on pages nine and ten of this Examination. I proceed to notice the section, entitled,

#### LEARNED CRITICS AND THEOLOGIANs.

This consists of sentences from the writings of learned Pedobaptists, men who practised sprinkling, containing the expression of opinions in favor of that

practice. No doubt, in this way a long chapter might easily be made. No doubt, all Pedobaptist theologians have been disposed to defend the custom of their church, on some ground or other. But whether those of them who are really eminent scholars, have made the proper meaning of the word the basis of their argument, is a distinct and an important question. Having presented a number of quotations, my reviewers say, "In view of these facts, in what light appears Mr. Hague's turgid boast, that all the learning of the world sustains his side of the controversy? He is confounded by his own witnesses." In connection with this remark, they exhibit a list of names, to which I made no reference at all,—the names of men whose works are almost entirely inaccessible to the American public, and whose writings the gentlemen have not quoted, with those references to the edition and the page, which would enable a reader to examine them for himself. Was it expected by our authors, that only those would read their book who would take every thing on trust, nor cherish one wish to verify their assertions?

Out of a list of thirty-seven names, there are only three whom I summoned as "witnesses." These are LUTHER, CALVIN and BEZA. They are names of note, and my claims to their testimony on the meaning of the word baptize, the only point on which I appealed to them, may be easily vindicated.

(1.) As to Luther, the reader has seen how ample and clear is the testimony which I have cited on pages 22—25 of this pamphlet. Let him ponder that soberly. He may consider, also, this which I now add from Luther's works: "The other thing which belongs to baptism, is the sign or the sacrament, which is the dipping into the water, from whence also it hath its name. For to baptize, IN GREEK, is to dip, and baptizing is dipping." "Baptism is a sign both of death and resurrection. Being moved

by this reason, I would have those who are to be baptized, to be altogether dipt into the water, as the word doth express, and the mystery doth signify." \* Neither of these remarks of the reformer is a mere "casual expression, which gives a clue to his opinions," as our authors designate some expressions which they quote; each one is a bold, simple, decisive expression of the truth. Will the gentlemen meet what I here bring forward fairly, and invalidate these citations, or else concede my claim to Luther's testimony?

(2.) As to Calvin, I quoted him as a scholar on the meaning of the word, declaring that on that ground he founded no defence of sprinkling. If he draws an argument from convenience, or the fitness of sprinkling as a symbol of a spiritual truth, that is quite another thing, and each one, for himself, may judge of its worth. But my opponents have quoted nothing from him which really affects my position. Their last citation has some appearance of doing this, but then, they have taken only half of the sentence; the other half and the succeeding one explain Calvin's views. I will quote them in connection, placing the quotation of the Rejoinder in smaller print, so as to mark it distinctly.

"But, whether the person baptized be wholly immersed, and whether thrice or not, or whether water be only poured or sprinkled upon him, IS OF NO IMPORTANCE."

Here Messrs. Cooke and Towne's quotation ends, and some exulting expressions follow. Calvin proceeds, "Churches ought to be left at liberty to act according to the *difference of countries*. The very word baptize, however, signifies to immerse, and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church."† Here, we see, the word HOWEVER marks the transition from Calvin's expressing a theological opinion, to his asserting the *real force* of

---

\* Works, Wittenburg edit., Tom. II, Fol. 79. † Institutes, Book IV, Chap. 15.

the word. On this point, his declaration is explicit, his concession is ample. Although this reformer did not, like Luther, endeavor fully to restore immersion, yet they both agree as to the import of the term.

What an unfortunate remark my reviewers have uttered, when they say, "Probably, Mr. Hague had never read Calvin, and cited him on the authority of some controversialist on his side of the question." This places me under the necessity of assuring them, that I have a manuscript, containing this extract from Calvin, penned by my own hand, long before I had the pleasure of knowing either of their names. Before I received ordination to the ministry, I consulted Calvin on this point, and this concession made a strong impression on my mind.

(3.) My third witness on this list is BEZA. They say that I quote him "with an air of triumph," and add, "but if Mr. Hague will adopt Beza's sentiments, there will be no further need of controversy." There is a little sophistry in this,—an evasion of the point. I spoke of Beza among the adherents of the custom of sprinkling, and cited his testimony, as a scholar, on the meaning of the word baptize. This testimony I urged as a CONCESSION. His practice of sprinkling rested on other grounds. His assertion of the meaning of the word is explicit. He declares what it does mean, and what it does not. (1.) He says it means MORE than *χερσιν πλυνειν* (to wash hands), because this has respect only to the hands; baptism, to the whole body. (2.) He says, "To be baptized in water, signifies no other than to be immersed in water, which is the external ceremony of baptism." He declares, "nor does *baptizein* signify to wash, except by consequence." This is positive and exclusive. Besides the quotation in my Review, let the reader notice that on the 15th page of this Examination. Our authors quote Beza as saying, "yet baptizo is *taken* more largely for any kind of washing, where there is no dipping at all." Well, Luther



said *it is so taken*, but declared that it could not be done properly, and therefore he wished immersion to be restored. That it is so taken now-a-days, is a fact which all admit; but whether it ought to be so, is an important question. That it was so taken in Beza's day, and had been long before, is evident. But Beza denied that this usage, introduced by the Latins, was in accordance with the proper meaning of the term. Our authors ask, "But does Beza say that it means *nothing but immersion*?" I answer, yes; his position is precisely that which I maintain in relation to it. Can any words be clearer than those which I have quoted? They ask, again, "Does Beza say that immersion is essential to the rite?" That is a different question. If Beza had been asked, what is the meaning of the words *bread* and *wine*, in the institution of the Lord's supper, he would undoubtedly have given the same answer that I should to that question. But whether he would agree with those who say that these elements are not *essential to the rite*, and that, under some circumstances, "fish and water" would answer the purpose, would remain to be seen. A man's assertion about the sense of words is one thing; his speculative opinions about the nature and importance of rites, is another thing. For instance, the QUAKERS do not hold to the necessity of water baptism at all; but they are strong in their assertion of the meaning of the term. BARCLAY, one of their leading writers, says, the Greek word *baptizo* signifies *immerse*, that is, to plunge and dip in; and that was the proper use of water baptism among the Jews, and also by John and the primitive Christians who used it; whereas our adversaries only sprinkle a little water on the forehead, which doth not at all answer to the word baptism."\* WILLIAM PENN and other FRIENDS assert the same thing; and as they set aside all

---

\* Works, Providence edit., p. 440.

outward modes, they may be considered impartial umpires on this question.

In perfect keeping with the editorial style of writing, and that *tact* in controversy recommended in the columns of the Puritan, our authors roundly assert, that I have been "proclaiming to the world that Beza is a close-communication Immerser!" And yet, on page 26 of my Review, I was particular to state his character and position, and to add, that he was not a Baptist in practice. I would not censure my opponents for cherishing some warmth of feeling in defending their sentiments; but this statement seems to glow with a spirit somewhat malign. They add, "we are almost tempted to exclaim, O shame! where is thy blush!" If this expression followed the discovery of some mistake on my part, I should not object to it, even though it were *severe*, for truth is sometimes severe. But connected as it is with an assertion so obviously unfounded, I deplore it as seeming like the effervescence of a ruffled mind, the expression of a feeling which it ill becomes Christian teachers to indulge.

Having established my claim to the testimony of the witnesses whom I cited, I would remark respecting others whom my reviewers have alluded to, that where they express their sentiments in favor of sprinkling on account of convenience, custom, the indifference of Christianity to all outward forms, on the fitness of sprinkling as a symbol of some spiritual truth, that quotations touching these arguments, are not at all to the point, when the great question is, what is the meaning of the word? If the principle, that "the Bible alone is the rule of faith," be that TRUTH which is the *life* of Protestantism, and if the word baptize, in Christ's commission, properly means immerse, as Luther, Calvin and Beza declare, then, we have no resort but to obey that command, or prove untrue to the vital spirit of the Reformation. The inconsistency of the early Protestants on this

point, was often urged against them by Catholic writers with very great effect.

Here we see on what side of the controversy stands the general

#### LITERATURE OF THE WORLD.

Referring to my remark, that the literature of the world is with us on this point, my Reviewers say, "this is comforting, if true." I assent to this, and add, it is true as it is comforting. When we leave the realm of dogmatic theology, and turn to those works which represent the literature of the world in history and philology, what do we find? All that we wish, to establish our position. Does such a work as the EDINBURGH ENCYCLOPEDIA represent any part of European literature? The very sentence which I have quoted on page 39, from Jones' Biblical Cyclopaedia, and refused to urge it on the attention of my reader as authority, because that author was a Baptist, may be found, word for word, in the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, and as coming from such a source, I now ask the reader to re-peruse it as a portion of the world's literature. Does the ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA deserve to be named as a standard work of British literature? It takes the same ground on this point as the Edinburgh, and asserts that sprinkling was introduced into England from a regard to convenience, and that immersion was "at length quite excluded," through the influence of the church of Geneva in the days of queen Elizabeth. Is the ENCYCLOPEDIA AMERICANA a work of any literary note? It takes a similar position, speaks of the custom of sprinkling having been received from the Romish church by Protestants, and being now practised by all of them except the Baptists. The ENCYCLOPEDIA ECCLESIASTICA, published under the sanction of the highest literary names in England, states the same thing, and declares, that when in ancient times, sprinkling was admitted in be-

half of persons, in great necessity, "at the point of death on a bed of sickness, it was considered indeed as not giving the party the full privileges of baptism." Such men as Porson, Neander, and Augusti, speaking as literary men, use the strongest expressions, the last of them saying, "the word baptism, according to ETYMOLOGY and USAGE, signifies to immerse, submerge, &c. ; and the choice of the word betrays an age in which the later custom of sprinkling had not been introduced."

Most of these great works our readers can consult for themselves; and if these things be so, and the Protestant principle be just, that the BIBLE ALONE is the rule of faith, it evidently follows that the commission of our Lord binds us to immersion.

#### THE CITATIONS FROM THE CLASSICS,

were shown in my Review, to have been falsely applied by the authors of the "Hints." I selected the strongest, especially the one printed in capitals, showed the fallacy of their application and the *principle* on which all the rest may be set aside. There are two important facts, however, connected with these cases, which I did not mention. I will now state the facts, and the reason why I did not mention them.

(1.) The first fact is this: those Greek sentences on which my opponents rely, to show that the word *baptize* does not define any way of applying water, contain a word which is NEVER USED in the New Testament to designate the ordinance of baptism. That word is *bapto*; the word used in the New Testament is *baptizo*. (2.) Between these words there is a marked difference. The latter is a consecrated term, *uniformly* applied by Christ and his apostles to his ordinance. The first (*bapto*) is never used to denote the ordinance, and the second (*baptizo*) is never used to denote the act of dyeing or coloring.

Of course, all those examples quoted by my opponents, containing only the word *bapto*, fail to answer their purpose. They are not to be regarded as *proofs*; for how can we prove the import of a rite, by means of a word which is never applied to it?

The reasons of my not mentioning these facts in my Review were these. When I wrote that brief pamphlet, I was aware that Dr. Carson had brought out this distinction clearly. But I had resolved at the outset to quote no Baptist writer as authority; knowing that among the Pedobaptists themselves, professed scholars somewhat removed from the din of controversy, had furnished ample means of confuting my opponents. And not having read the article of Prof. Stuart since the year 1833, when it was published, and then, with an eye to the main points only, it did not occur to me that he had also marked this distinction, and expressed his full agreement with Dr. Carson on this point. Prof. Stuart read Dr. Carson's work, while his own article was going through the press, and refers his reader to it for more copious illustration. Not remembering this at the time, I refused to avail myself of the distinction pointed out by Dr. Carson. It was not necessary for me to do it, because to me it is evident, that the primary meaning of *bapto* has never been lost, but that it lives and modifies all the applications of the word; or as Dr. Carson himself declares (p. 74), "These two meanings, dip and dye, are as parent and child." But since I find, on re-examining Prof. Stuart's treatise, that he also is clear and decisive in stating the difference, and that it cannot be called a peculiarity of the Baptists, I am ready to propose it, and call on all our readers to observe, that my opponents, in order to prove their point, rely on the secondary meaning of a word, which is never used in the Bible to denote the ordinance of baptism. As the inspired writers carefully avoid the application of the shorter word used by dyers to the sacred rite,



there must have been in this, some design of the divine Spirit; and our authors have not pleaded one instance in their own favor, in which the word used in the New Testament occurs at all? In their examples, however, they cover up this fact from the eye of the English reader, by putting the English word (baptize) in a parenthesis, instead of spelling the Greek word, so as to show which of the two they employ.

As I said, I did not intend to avail myself of this distinction, until I found that Prof. Stuart stands up with Dr. Carson as a witness, to all Pedobaptists, of the important fact. Although apart from this distinction, it may be proved most clearly, that Christ enjoined immersion in the commission, yet the statement just made, is a mighty stride towards settling the controversy. All who look closely at the subject see it to be so, and when Dr. Carson defies all the Greek scholars in the world to produce an instance in which (*baptizo*) baptize means to dye or color, if his position be maintained, they well know the ultimate result, in a land where intelligence is diffused, where conscience is free, and the Bible exalted as the rule of faith and practice. They see the wisdom of Prof. Stuart, in placing his adherence to sprinkling, not so much on the ground of scriptural evidence, as on the indifference of all modes.

In the preceding remarks, the reader will see the reason why Dr. Carson manifests so little interest in contending for those examples in which the word *bapto* occurs. His mind is filled with the importance of the fact, that this word is never used to designate the Christian rite, and that it is not the turning point of the controversy. He feels strong, too, in his position, that the word which *is applied* to the ordinance, is never used by dyers, nor applied to the act of coloring. He is desirous to narrow the ground of controversy, and is prepared to say to all his opponents, Now, brethren, what will you do? Your

arguments for different modes are built on the secondary use of *bapto*, and are not apposite to this case. Even if I should concede all that you wish as to that word, you will not have touched the main point in question. And I defy you to prove, that in Greek literature, the word *baptizo* must necessarily have any secondary meaning at all.

In connection with their remarks on the classical use of the words, our authors introduce a letter from Rev. Edward Beecher, D. D., called forth by a reference which I made to one of his statements on the 31st page of my Review. The criticisms here presented are worthy of note, and I would ask the reader's particular attention to

PRESIDENT BEECHER'S LETTER.

The occasion of this letter, addressed to Rev. Mr. Towne, was an allusion which I made to the following remark of Pres. Beecher, on the Jewish ritual: "Nor is the washing of clothes, so often spoken of, enjoined by a word denoting immersion." Against this statement, I quoted a law of purification recorded in Numbers 31 : 23, — 'and all that abideth not the fire, ye shall make *go through the water.*'

In regard to this law, President Beecher says, "it is not a specific command to wash clothes at all, but a general command to cause that to pass through the water which will not stand the fire." In reply to this suggestion, I would respectfully ask, if the word *raiment* does not mean *clothes*? If it does not, then Dr. Beecher's remark is just: if otherwise, then it is erroneous, because in the context, *raiment* is specified as one of the articles to be purified by water. In verse 20th, it is said, 'purify all your raiment, and all that is made of skins, and all work of goats' hair, and all things made of wood!' Now if raiment denotes clothes, and raiment is *specified* as an article to go through the water, then this is a *specific* command to wash clothes.

Dr. Beecher observes, moreover, that "the passage refers to the purification of spoils taken from an enemy. It does not relate to the 'washing of the clothes so often spoken of.' This was the washing of the person's own clothes." I did not think, that he would fix on a distinction like this; for what reason in the world can we have to imagine that their mode of washing clothes taken from an enemy, would differ from their usual mode of washing their own clothes when unclean? Did any Jew ever suppose, that his own clothes could be washed or purified by sprinkling?

Again; Dr. Beecher says, that if this passage did contain the command which he refers to, "it contains no word denoting immersion." To this I answer, it contains a *phrase* which involves necessarily the idea of immersion, and is adapted to *explain* what Moses meant, and what the Jews understood to be the proper way of washing clothes.

Again, Dr. Beecher says, "The command to which I did refer, occurs in the very next verse, and fully sustains my assertion."—"I spoke of a word in which an oft-repeated injunction is given, and mentioned the identical word, viz. טָבַחַ, and affirmed that it did not denote immersion," and will Mr. Hague venture to deny the truth of my assertion concerning it?" (p. 114—115.) In answer to this, I would ask, in return, does not President Beecher know that the Hebrew word in question truly and properly denotes, *to tread or press down something*, namely clothes, *in a trough or other vessel*? And if water was used for washing, that the act of treading or pressing down the clothes in the vessel involved their immersion, of course? Can clothes be trodden down in a vessel of water, and not be immersed? Now, that this is the real *force* of the word, there can be no doubt. It is directly asserted by Gesenius, in his lexicon; and, if the reader would fain be satisfied, I would ask him to turn to the word in Dr. Robinson's edition of that

work. Let not Dr. Beecher say, then, that it is I who *venture* to deny his statement; I only assert that it is denied by the best Hébraists in the world. The question, whether his assertion of the native force of the word be right or wrong, turns on the answer to another, namely, whether, if clothes are trodden down in a vessel of water, it necessarily follows that they are immersed, or not?

While President Beecher's pen is in his hand, he takes the opportunity to present Mr. Towne with several "authorities and facts," to show "that those to whom the Greek was vernacular, did regard *baptizo* as signifying to purify, irrespective of mode." The first passage is from CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (Strom., Book IV). In this, that learned writer asserts two things, an opinion and a fact. (1.) The opinion is, *that a resemblance of baptism proceeded from Moses to the Greek poets*. "He illustrates it by two instances: Penelope *washed* herself, and put on clean apparel, and went to her devotions. Telemachus *washed* his hands in the ocean, and prayed to Minerva." For the first case of *washing*, Homer uses the word *udraino*; for the second case, *nipto*. President Beecher's question is, whether these washings, which were a resemblance of Mosaic baptisms, are expressed by words denoting immersion. His first question is this: "Is not *udraino* a generic word, to denote washing or purification? Is it not as generic as *katharizo*?" I reply, *it is not* as generic as *katharizo*, to denote purification, for this latter applies to purification by fire or by expiation, as well as by water. The former word is confined to water. It means wetting and washing, and is often applied to the act of bathing. (See Donnegan's Lexicon.) We know that bathing was among the sacred rites of the Greeks, and this fact would interpret to them the idea of Homer as to the case of Penelope. An act of bathing among the Greeks would resemble an act of bathing among the He-



brews, sufficiently to suggest to Clement the thought, that the one people derived the rite from the other.

So in regard to washing hands. President Beecher asks, "Dare any one say that *nipito* denotes immersion? Is washing of the hands immersion?" I answer, the hands *may* be washed without their immersion; but the declaration of Homer is, "Telemachus washed his hands *in the ocean.*" That was undoubtedly immersion. What Clement declares is just this; that such was the resemblance between the Jewish and the Grecian rites, that the latter might have been taken from the former. Such was his opinion.

(2.) The FACT which Clement states, is, that "this was the custom of the Jews, that they should be often baptized" — HOW? in what circumstances? "Upon their couches," says President Beecher. I have the best authority in the world, for saying that Clement asserted no such thing. This last phrase is a wrong translation. His expression is, they were baptized, — *ἐπι κοιτη* ("post concubitum"); that is, *after the use of the bed.* The word in Clement is the same as that used by Paul in Romans, where it is rendered "chambering."\* The best edition of Clement's works, is that of Archbishop Potter, published in England in the year 1715, and re-published at Venice in 1757, under the sanction of the Doge and several Italian scholars. The latter edition is the one which I have consulted,—an edition more highly respected in Europe for the sake of reference, than any other. The learned editor has a note on this very phrase, *ἐπι κοιτη*; and referring to a certain writer, who had rendered it in Latin by the words, "in lecto,"—on the couch,—pronounces it to be a corrupt translation.†

---

\* Rom. 13: 13.

† The note is as follows: *ἐπι κοιτη*—Hoc est post concubitum. Hervetus *perperam vertit, in lecto.*



It is probable that this Latin version was the source of President Beecher's mistake. As to its merits, Archbishop Potter says, "The translation of Hervetus, which is the one most used by learned men, although often altered for the better, nevertheless in many things, even yet, is so foreign from the author's meaning, in others so lame and imperfect, in very many cases so ambiguous and obscure, that often in Clement's own work, there is nothing more wanting than Clement himself; and not unfrequently the Latin needs to be explained by the Greek, more than the Greek by the Latin. And, finally, he who should undertake to correct this as much as the case requires, would evidently be cleaning an Augean stable."

What now becomes of President Beecher's assertion, that, according to Clement, the Jews were baptized on their beds? It is seen to be founded on an error. The best editions of Clement, published in Europe a century ago, would have furnished him the means of avoiding it, if he had carefully consulted them. But it is evident that he has been hasty. If this is a specimen of his way of reading the Greek fathers, his citations from them will not possess a very high authority.

The letter before us presents two instances of the use of *bapto*, which are said to be "quite decisive" against the idea of immersion. The first is from the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius (Book 4, lines 156, 157), where, it is said, "occurs the most remarkable case of immersion or dipping on record, if it be true that *bapto* always means to dip." Others, however, who are well acquainted with the work just mentioned, and who have no theological theory to support, have found nothing remarkable in this case of dipping. It was such a dipping as occurs every day. It was not, as President Beecher thinks, the *baptism of a serpent*. The facts are these. A HUGE SERPENT rises up before Medea and Jason, —

“with uplifted head seeking to devour them. Medea then resorts to a soporific mixture in a cup or goblet, and, in the words of the poet,”

Ἡ δὲ μιν ἀρκευθοιο νεον τετμεοι θαλλῶ  
 Βαπτους' ἐκ κυκεωνος ἀκηρατα φαρμακ' αοιδαις  
 ῥαϊνε κατ' οφθαλμων.

That is (“if *bapto* means dip”), she, with a newly cut juniper bough, dipping out of the cup the strong poisons, sprinkled them, with songs, upon his eyes. Now in this case, the dipping was not ‘remarkable.’ It is natural enough to dip a bough in a liquid, *in order* to sprinkle the liquid. Just as in Numbers 19 : 18, Moses commands that one should “dip hyssop in the water, and sprinkle it upon the tent.” The difference between one and the other act, is distinctly marked in both cases. Apollonius *does not say that the serpent was baptized at all*; but that the leafy rod of juniper was dipped, and with it, the serpent was sprinkled about the eyes.

That my statement of the meaning of the poet in this passage is correct, may be more evident to the reader, by looking at the following translation of it, from a celebrated work. It was made by Fawkes, who published translations of Apollonius, Sappho, Bion, Moschus, and other Greek poets. It may be found in Anderson’s British Poets. It runs thus :

A branch of juniper the maid applies,  
 STEEPED in a baneful potion, to his eyes;  
 Its odors strong the branch diffused around,  
 And sunk the enormous beast in sleep profound.

Lond. Edit., 1795.

Certainly, the translator saw both dipping and sprinkling here : the first, of the bough, the second, of the beast.

But President Beecher remarks, “the Greek scholiast sees no immersion here.” On what ground does the President say this? Simply because the Greek scholiast declares that “in these and the following

words the poet says, that Medea, *sprinkling* the poison with the juniper branch, put the dragon to sleep.' Very true. That is evident enough. But does the scholiast say, that Medea did not dip the bough? Not at all. Unfortunately for Pres. Beecher's version of the passage, he has thrown in the remark, that "the editor illustrates it by a reference to the passage in Virgil, in which the god of sleep shakes a bough, moistened with Lethean water, over the temples of Palinurus, and puts him to sleep." But did it not occur to our author, that Virgil speaks of that bough as having been soaked in the river Styx,—*"vique Stygia soporatum?"*\* The reader may see how distinctly this is expressed by the translation of Dr. Trapp, professor of poetry at Oxford:—

Wet with Lethean dew, and steeped in Styx.

In our school-boy days we read the passage over and over again, but never imagined that a bough had the power of scattering drops of Stygian water, without having first been put into it.

I am much obliged to Pres. Beecher for alluding to this passage in Virgil, it is such a capital example, so exactly to the point. The bough was dipped, and then the water was sprinkled with it. As Potter observes in his Grecian Antiquities, it was customary with the Greeks to dip a torch in sacred water, and then sprinkle surrounding objects. For a torch, they often substituted a bough.† This is just what was done by Medea. According to Pliny, a juniper bough was deemed particularly effectual against serpents.‡ We see, at a glance, from the nature of the case, that the bough must have been dipped in the poisonous drugs, in order to smear the serpent's eyes. The version in some sense speaks for itself. The mention of the dipping of the leafy rod, was neces-

\* Æneid, v. 854.

† Potter's Gr. Ant., lib. ii, chap. 4.

‡ Pliny, lib. xxiv, c. 8.

sary to a complete description of the act of Medea. Without this, an important circumstance would have been omitted. With this, every thing is natural and in its place. And with this, the passage presents no difficulty at all. It is only necessary to look at it closely in its connection, in order to be convinced. Time was, when in the court of Pharaoh, Aaron threw down a rod upon the ground, and it became a serpent; but in this case as put by Pres. Beecher, when we set clearly in the light the subject of Medea's baptism, behold another wonder;—*the serpent becomes a rod!*

A SECOND EXAMPLE. To show that *bapto* has lost its primary meaning of immersion, another passage is cited from Lucien. The writer does not tell where his quotation occurs; but the reader may find it in the dialogue between Lycinus and the Cynic. We are told by Pres. Beecher, that if *bapto* means to dip, the sentence is, "the flesh of the shell-fish (called *πορφυρα*) can not only be eaten, but can also dip or immerse." He adds, "dip or immerse what? And how can flesh dip or immerse any thing?" To this I answer, that Lucien himself has told how, in the preceding sentence, which our author has omitted to notice. Lucien has told precisely what he means, and his *meaning* is entirely consonant with the idea of immersion. Look at the preceding sentence. The Cynic asks Lycinus, if those who use the shell-fish not only for food, but for dyeing, *by manufacturing the flesh into dye-stuff liquids*,\* do not act contrary to nature? Lycinus answers, No: that nature had rendered the flesh of the fish fit not only to be eaten, but also (*baptein*) to dye. Now, although Lucien has just explained the *manner* of this dyeing, that it is done by *making a dye-stuff liquid out of the flesh*, Pres. Beecher overlooks this

---

\* Βαφας μηχανωμενοι. See Donnegan's Lex. on βαφας.

as if it were quite irrelevant. Is it proper to take a fragment of a conversation, which expresses only a part of an idea, and build an argument upon it, as if it contained the whole? If Lucien tells us that the dyeing was performed by manufacturing the flesh into a liquid, then we see how in this case the word *bapto* may denote dyeing by dipping.

Although I have spoken of the difference between *bapto* and *baptizo*, and of the reason why the former is comparatively an unimportant word in this discussion, yet I am not willing to see even this word seized by force, and pressed, contrary to its nature, into the service of a cause which it disowns. Its primary meaning, to dip, still lives; and while it lives, will modify the applications of the word. To denote the act of dyeing in other ways, other words are used, although by a rhetorical figure, this may be employed to denote simply a certain *effect*, or the appearance of a thing when it looks *as if it had been dipped*. Thus, the ancients called a certain gem *baptēs*: why? It had not been colored by art, it had never been affected by sprinkling, pouring, or dipping; it retained its natural hue, but it was called *baptēs*, because it appeared *as if it had been dipped*. So in regard to the priests at Athens called BAPTAI, of whom our authors speak; they used paint in a way which suggested the same idea. On that passage in the Old Testament where we are told that Jezebel 'painted her face,' Bishop Patrick remarks, that the Hebrew expression is, "she put her eyes in paint." The *appearance* of the eye was here referred to; for the custom of dipping a bodkin or silver wire in *stibium*, a dye-stuff, and moving it under the eyelid, caused the ball of the eye to look *as if it had been put into paint*. The BAPTAI at Athens, however, were called by that name not merely from the use of paint, but because in their initiating rites they were immersed in warm water. (On this see Stephanus's Latin Thesaurus.)



In regard to *lexicons*, President Beecher has made some very singular remarks. He says that he has examined several made by Greek writers, with definitions in Greek, and gives us a specimen of what he calls a *definition* from one of them. He says, Zonaras expressly defines *baptism* to be "forgiveness of sins by water and the Spirit!" This is no definition of the word at all. It is a theological notion, annexed to the word by a certain class of Christians. It is amazing that such a sentiment as this should be laid before us, as having any thing to do with a *definition* of the word baptize. Among the ancients of different ages, baptism had various names of dignity, according to prevailing notions. They are enumerated in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, as well as in other works. Baptism was called *palingenesis*, or *laver of regeneration*; it was called *life*, *salvation*, *the seal of God*, *the seal of faith*, *mystery*, *sacrament*, *the gift of the Lord*, *consecration*, *consummation*, *initiation*, and *viaticum* from its being administered to departing persons. It was called, too, the *sacrament of faith*, the *great circumcision*, and *purification*, which last is the favorite name with President Beecher. But none of these names contain a *definition* of the word. Each one, in fact, is an eulogy on the ordinance. It would be as easy to show from "ecclesiastical usage," that baptism means "regeneration," or "salvation," as that it means purification. In the writings of the fathers, it is often interchanged with regeneration; the one is substituted for the other. If President Beecher can maintain his position in regard to *purification*, more strongly still can the Papist maintain his in regard to *baptismal regeneration*. The arguments of either one are as good as those of the other. They are intimately connected; and he who takes one, will be logically and morally bound to take both.

In closing his letter, President Beecher alludes to the assertion which I made, that on this question,

the Baptists have the learning of modern Europe on their side. He says, that even if he admitted the truth of this claim, he would reply, "BEFORE THEIR TRIBUNAL I REFUSE TO STAND." This sentence deserves to be remembered. Even if President Beecher were forced to own that *all the learning of modern Europe is against him*, although it be on a question which turns on the meaning of a word, still would he not relinquish his ground. The ground which he occupies is certainly very *high*, if all the learning of modern Europe cannot reach it.

But to whom does he appeal? At whose judgment-seat will he stand? He appeals to the Greek fathers,—the men who wrote Greek, to whom the language was vernacular. But the modern Greeks read their books as easily as we read English, and with one voice, declare that the fathers understood the word baptize to mean immerse. Before their tribunal, Prof. Stuart has stood; and what verdict did he bring away? He says, speaking of immersion, that the Greek fathers, and the Latin ones who were familiar with the Greek, understood this to be the *meaning*, the usual import of *baptizo*, "*would hardly seem capable of denial.*"\* Yet, after this, their decision, announced by the more aged professor, we behold President Beecher, a younger man, going into their court, and, as if they had never said a word, appealing to them with the question, Does not baptize mean *to purify*? We are well aware, that some of the most learned and judicious men of President Beecher's denomination smile kindly at his generous enthusiasm in defence of their cause, and frankly aver that he cannot succeed in sustaining his peculiar theory.

Having thus noticed the various statements of the letter, the reader will observe my entire

---

\* Biblical Repository, Vol. III, p. 362.

## COMPLIANCE WITH MESSRS. COOKE &amp; TOWNE'S REQUEST.

In regard to the letter, they say, "the examples cited are decisive. We call the attention of Mr. Hague to them particularly." I have bestowed the attention which they demanded. And now I call on them to say, whether they will admit that their friend, on whom they called for aid, has not correctly represented the meaning of Clement in regard to the Jews *being often baptized on their beds*, or whether they will assert that Archbishop Potter, the author of the Greek Archæology, and the editor of Clement's works, together with those Italian scholars who republished his edition of Clement in Venice, were quite unable to translate the sentence, and, of course, quite unfortunate in not having been able to derive some light from Illinois? I have quoted a note of that learned editor, containing a positive denial that the sentence in Clement can have such a sense as President Beecher attributes to it. Again, will they continue to insist that the poet Apollonius declares that Medea baptized the HUGE SERPENT; or will they admit the version which says she dipped the bough, and sprinkled the dragon with it; a version which is sustained by the highest authorities, which an unlearned reader can see is by far the most natural, and which contains internal evidence of being true? We shall see how they will pass this trial of their candor.

In justice to President Beecher, however, it ought to be said, that he is more clear in the statement of his principles, and more consistent in his reasonings, than Messrs. Cooke and Towne. They assert that the word *baptize* means to sprinkle. He denies that it denotes any specific act. They take first one meaning, and then another, just as it suits them. He denies that this can be properly done. He says (Bib. Repos., 2d series, p. 42, Jan., 1840), "If we adopt the generic meaning, purify or cleanse, we

must adhere to it at all times, when speaking of the rite. On the other hand, if we adopt a specific meaning, as immerse, or sprinkle, we must *adhere* to it in the same way, and not pass from the generic to the specific, or from the specific to the generic, according to the exigencies, on the ground that the word *baptizo* may, in the whole circuit of its use, mean sometimes one thing and sometimes another. Nor must we adopt *both*; for however numerous the possible meanings of a word may be in its various *usages*, it has in each particular case but one meaning, and in all similar cases its meaning is the same. Hence, the word *baptizo*, as applied to a given rite, has not two or many meanings, but *ONE*, and to that one, we should in all cases adhere."

We deem these principles to be just. And if they are, they cut up by the roots the doctrines of Messrs. Cooke and Towne, touching the various meanings of the word. And as to President Beecher himself, if he fails to prove that the word means simply and properly to *purify*, they leave him no ground on which to stand for the defence of different modes of baptism.

In regard to President Beecher's attempt to show that the word *baptize* means to *purify*, I have said, that by the same process the Catholics might prove that it means to *regenerate*; and in my former reply to the reasonings of Messrs. Cooke and Towne, p. 19, I had occasion to notice the

#### SIMILARITY OF THE ARGUMENTS FOR UNIVERSALISM AND SPRINKLING.

I would again refer the reader to that paragraph. As to the word *aionion*, eternal, on which the discussion with Universalists generally turns, they speak of its great variety of meanings, and of its uncertainty. Just so my reviewers speak of the word *baptizo*. On page 122 of the Rejoinder, they ask if I have "seen no successful arguments against Universalists



by Pedobaptist writers?" I answer that I have; but not exactly on the philological principles of our authors. Did Prof. Stuart, in his discussion of that subject, admit that *eternal* was not the native and proper meaning of *aionios*? Or, admitting that it had been, did he allow that this meaning had ever been "merged and lost?" Not at all. He declares that when *aionios* is used to denote something of limited duration, it is used *catachrestically*. And with rhetoricians, what is a *catachresis*? It is defined, "a harsh trope, by which a word is forced into an application contrary to its *proper* meaning." An instance of this is found, in applying the word *everlasting* to any thing temporary, as in the conversational phrase, *everlasting talker*, *everlasting plague*, &c. Does Prof. Stuart allow the Universalists to get off by saying that this distinction is of no importance, and that "other meanings are other meanings, come from what source they may?" No. He holds them to the proper meaning of the word, as well when it is applied to future misery, as to future happiness. The word Gehenna, too, was primarily the name of a place in Judea, known as a scene of gloom and wretchedness. It was *transferred*, as a proper name, to a place of gloom and wretchedness in the invisible world; but its primary meaning modifies and *limits* its application, or else it might be given as a proper name to heaven as well as to hell,—to a scene of happiness as well as of misery. Let it be admitted, that the primary meanings of these words have been "merged and lost," and their real sense may be easily hidden in a mist of uncertainty.

#### BAPTISM OF BEDS.

It is said by President Beecher, in his letter, p. 117, "Our credulity has been sorely taxed to believe that couches were habitually immersed by the Jews." Yet it is asserted in Mark 7: 4, that the Pharisees baptized cups, pots, brazen vessels, and couches.



(This last word is rendered *tables*, in our version.) Now, why should it be deemed incredible, that they immersed these things, considering the superstitious character of the men? Did not our Saviour rebuke them for their proneness to go beyond the law of observances? Would they not "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel?" They could do many things which would seem hard to others. Our authors speak of them as if they were reasonable men; but Mark represents them as being just the reverse. He speaks of them as very superstitious, as following tradition instead of the Bible; but when he gives the *facts* which sustain his assertion, shall we say, they tax our credulity? Why, if there was nothing marvellous about them, they would never have been mentioned for such a purpose.

In my Review, I quoted from the celebrated Rabbi Maimonides, the rule which required them to immerse their couches. This is PROOF. My reviewers do not attempt to invalidate it. There stands the rule, which requires the Jew to immerse his couch, "part by part." Why do they not meet it fairly? They ought to disprove it, or else concede the argument.

I referred to Calmet, to show the *possibility* of immersing couches, but my reviewers say, they can find nothing to the point. I had in my mind such expressions as these, which the reader may find in Calmet. "The word Bed, is in many cases calculated to mislead and perplex the reader. The beds in the East are very different from those used in this part of the world, and our attention to this, is indispensable to the right apprehension of several passages of Holy Writ."—He adds, that frequently the bed spoken of in the Bible, is nothing more than "a cotton quilt folded double." He quotes from Psalms the sentence, "I make my bed to *swim*, and water my couch with tears," to show, that a Jewish couch might be so hard that tears would "run over it." It occurred to me, that these facts might tend to

remove any difficulties which might arise from one's associating the term *bed* with such structures as bear that name amongst us. But as our authors cannot see how they bear upon the point, I must commend them to the judgment of the candid reader. Let him remember that my reviewers concede, that baptize *often* means immerse; and as to its meaning in this passage, let him connect with it the *fact* that these articles were immersed. I ask again, which are the clearer lights; such authorities as these, or the assertions of my reviewers.

#### JOHN'S BAPTISM.

In their "Hints," Messrs. Cooke and Towne have expressed their belief, that for John to have immersed all those to whom he administered baptism, would have been an impossibility, because it would have required more time and strength than he possessed. They suppose that John baptized half a million. This calculation I treated as a mere *guess*. They seem to think it unreasonable, that I should not regard it as a thing proved. They found it upon the expression, "then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him." That people crowded to him from all these parts, we readily admit; but it can be easily shown, that John did not baptize even a *majority* of the converts. For, 1st, we are expressly told, that Jesus "made and baptized MORE DISCIPLES THAN JOHN;"\* and, 2dly, we know that the great proportion of the higher classes were baptized by neither. The Pharisees and lawyers rejected John,† and of Jesus it was asked long afterward, "Have any of the rulers or Pharisees believed on him?" The expression touching Jerusalem going out to the wilderness, is a general one, denoting many from the various classes of society. Some went merely *to see*; others who asked for baptism were denied.‡ Moreover, the public ministry of Je-

\* John 4: 1.

† Luke 7: 30.

‡ Matt. 3: 7.

sus was twice as long as that of John; and if, in the space of time allotted to him, John baptized *half a million*, and Jesus made disciples in a still *more rapid* ratio, then at the time of Christ's death there must have been not far from three millions of persons who had embraced his religion in that little land of Palestine. What a new idea is this! Surely, it could not have been said with much propriety, "Who hath believed our report?" Nor could the church have been called properly "a *little* flock." Compared with such an increase, the triumphs of the apostles could not have seemed very marvellous, nor the descent of the promised Spirit so very marked as is generally believed. But the fact is clear that this calculation is a very hasty assumption.

Our authors speak of my treating their remarks touching the phrase "Much water," in John 3: 23, with ridicule. They were dissatisfied with our English version, and said, that in the original the phrase is *πολλα τα υδατα*, many waters — denoting little rivulets. I answered this by saying that in Rev. 14: 2, the same phrase is used to designate *the ocean*. This was "no sneer," but an argument. I still deem it a sound one. I see no reason to be dissatisfied with our English translation, which denotes abundance of water.

#### BAPTISM OF CHRIST.

The learned Dr. Whitby of the church of England, in his commentary on the narration of Christ's baptism in Matt. 3, speaks of the decisive voice of the Greeks on the import of baptism, quotes the Jewish rule on the subject, and declares that a doubt whether John *immersed* Jesus, must arise from *ignorance*. As Whitby was a Pedobaptist, one of the most eminent of his age for biblical knowledge, and quoted by succeeding writers on almost every theological topic, I may be allowed to ask for his plain statement a candid consideration. The copy of his work which I have used, belongs to the Boston Athenæum, and is in two quarto volumes.

In their "Hints," our authors stated that Christ was baptized as a priest,—that his baptism was his legal initiation into the office. In answer to this, I said, that the requisitions of the Mosaic law could not apply to the priesthood of Christ, "for it is evident" (says Paul, Heb. 7: 14) "that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake *nothing* concerning priesthood." My opponents ask, whether I have "thus penned a denial of the priesthood of Christ," and speak of the influence of "German writers," in a case where there was no occasion to allude to them. I have no idea, however, that they have any real doubts of my orthodoxy on this point. The question is asked only for effect. My argument on this point is very brief. I will just state it and leave it. 1. The rites of initiation into the priesthood were enjoined by the Mosaic law; 2. But in the tribe to which our Lord belonged, that law recognized *no* *priesthood*. 3. Therefore Christ's baptism could not have been a legal initiation into the priesthood.

#### BAPTISM OF THE THREE THOUSAND.

In their first work, Messrs. Cooke and Towne stated their belief, that the three thousand converts on the day of Pentecost could not have been immersed in Jerusalem, for the want of water. "The brook Cedron was dry, and no suitable place could be found." On page 30 of my Review, I expressed my astonishment that they should speak thus, since the publication of Dr. Robinson's work on Palestine, in which the vast extent of reservoirs and pools is amply exhibited, and where it is stated that never, even in a siege, was there "a want of water within the city." What do they reply to this? That "water in *wells* might answer all the purposes of standing a siege, and yet not be very convenient for immersing." But let it be observed, Dr. Robinson does not say that the water chiefly was in *wells*, but just the contrary. Have the gentlemen, even yet, not looked at Dr.



Robinson's statements? The city *now* abounds in relics of fountains, cisterns, pools, baths, reservoirs, basins, and conduits, which indicate an abundance of water, and great facilities for adapting its flow or confinement to every imaginable purpose.

In connection with remarks on the baptism of the three thousand, I stated that Chrysostom of Constantinople, immersed in one day, 3000 catechumens, young persons who had been instructed in Christianity, and that in doing it he had none to assist him but the clergy of his own church. The gentlemen say, that I give them "*no authority for so incredible a fact.*" Here then is the authority, — *Chrysostom himself.* He says, that "the emperor was affected at the sight of the newly-baptized, for they were about *three thousand.*" See his Ep. ad Innocent, vol. iii, p. 518.\*—Neander's Life of Chrysostom, vol. ii, p. 225. Could we have better authority for this historical fact which occurred on the great Sabbath, April 16th, 404. That these were immersed there can be no doubt, for Chrysostom calls baptism a "plunging into the water and raising out of it," and is quoted by Prof. Stuart in the Biblical Repository (vol. iii, p. 358), as expressing his idea in the following sentence: "We as in a sepulchre, immersing our heads in water, the old man is buried, and, *sinking down*, the whole is concealed at once; then, as we emerge, the new man again rises." (Chrysostom in cap. iii, Johannis.) Moreover, Chrysostom, in the case before us, speaks of the baptisteries; (*αι κολυμβηθραι*;) and we know that the grand baptistery of the church of St. Sophia, built in the age of Constantine, was a spacious and splendid work.

Here, then, is a well attested *fact*, that 3000 were immersed in one day at one place, for it is said, that they were assembled on the preceding evening, and were ready, waiting the approach of the appointed day, according to the custom of those times. Here is

---

\* This reference is to the edition of Chrysostom, published at Paris, by Montfaucon.



a DECISIVE FACT; let it be considered. I would ask my reviewers if Chrysostom of old, and Neander of modern times, may be relied on as good *historical* authorities?

#### BAPTISM OF THE ETHIOPIAN.

Our authors continue to insist that the Ethiopian must have read something about *sprinkling* in the prophet Isaiah, chap. 52, although there is no reason to doubt, that he was reading the Septuagint version, from which Luke draws his quotation, and in which that verb is rendered *astonish*. This I mentioned in my Review, p. 32. Without protracting debate on this point, I will only cite a remark from DR. BARNES'S notes on Isaiah, which applies to the case. It is a comment on the passage in question. He says, "It may be remarked, that whichever of the above senses is assigned, it furnishes no argument for the practice of sprinkling in baptism. It refers to the fact of his purifying or cleansing the nations, and not to the ordinance of Christian baptism. *Nor should it be used as an argument in reference to the mode in which that should be administered.*"

#### BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The question is sometimes asked, why is it that the Baptists insist so strongly on the primitive mode of baptism, but not on the necessity of celebrating the Lord's Supper, in the *manner* of Christ and the apostles. It is said, that they celebrated it at evening, in an upper room, reclining at their table; and why should we not with equal reason urge conformity to their example in these particulars? I answer, these particulars are not mentioned in the law. The Christian dispensation has but two rites; and the *acts essential* to these, are involved in precisely THREE ENACTING TERMS—IMMERSE, EAT, DRINK. These words are words of command; they are in the imperative mood. Here is the Christian ritual. We have no more right to alter one part than we have to obliterate the whole. To do either, is to act on a principle

which, if followed out, would subvert the authority of Christ as a legislator. When we shall stand in his holy presence, and our past life shall be reviewed, we shall doubtless feel it to have been a serious business, to interpret to others the meaning of those words which express the specific actions enjoined by him on every believer.

#### HOW SPRINKLING CAME TO BE CALLED BAPTISM.

It is an historical fact, and worthy to be remembered on account of its bearings in this discussion, that sprinkling came to be called baptism, not on philological grounds, not in view of the meaning of the words, but on the ground of church *authority*. A power arose in Christendom, which, after corrupting Christian doctrines, began to "think to change times and laws." Having made baptism essential to salvation, it mercifully decreed that if an unbaptized person could not be removed from his bed, the application of water to him in the bed should be considered as baptism; but *only in this case of necessity*.\* As sprinkling afterwards became more common, arguments in favor of calling it baptism, began to be urged from certain *figurative* uses of the latter term. The fallacy of these arguments has been shown; prevailing custom gave them currency in Europe, and reverence for custom has given them influence in this country.

#### THE ARGUMENT FROM FIGURES.

The most curious instances of endeavoring to establish the proper meaning of a word from its *figurative uses*, embrace the word *bapto*, not *baptizo*: and of these, the strangest, is that one cited from Homer's poem, entitled "The Battle of the Frogs and Mice." The whole poem is hyperbolic, abounding in the boldest exaggeration. Fifteen of the mice, and eighteen of the frogs, have names given to them as leading combatants. Jupiter calls a council of the frogs, to arrest the conflict, and when

---

\* See page 114.

he interposes by his thunder, the earth quakes from pole to pole. Pope's translation gives us the spirit of the poem, in those lines where Jupiter cries,

What seas of blood I view, what worlds of slain;  
An Iliad rising from a day's campaign!

Well, to show what an awful event was the death of one of the heroes, a fighting frog named Crambophagus, Homer tells us that the lake was dyed with his blood. The idea which the spirit of the piece presents to the view, is that of a lake appearing as if it had been turned into blood, or *covered* with it. To form an hyperbole for the occasion, Homer seizes a word used to denote the dyeing of any thing by *covering* it with a liquid. Such a word was *bapto*, which, if it meant to sprinkle, would have made no *hyperbole*, and would not have suited his purpose. If from this figure of Homer, it follows that *bapto* means to sprinkle, it would follow from the poet Cowley's hyperbole, that to *drown* means merely to *wet*, for he says of Goliath, that he lay "drowned in his own blood." If such principles of reasoning were admitted, language would fail to convey any ideas with certainty.

#### BRIEF SUMMARY. .

In order to come to a just conclusion touching a discussion, it is necessary to keep clearly in mind the main points on which it must turn. In the present case, these points are comprised in a few FACTS and PRINCIPLES.

One great FACT is this, that in the first ages of Christianity, immersion prevailed throughout the world.—See pp. 58, 114, &c. The ancient baptisteries of Europe still stand as proofs of this.

Another great FACT is, that the first deviations from this rule were allowed in behalf of those who were confined to beds of sickness, and were called *clinic* baptisms. The superstitious notion that the outward rite was of saving efficacy, introduced these exceptions.—See p. 114, and the articles there referred to.

The third great FACT is, that when, at the time of the Reformation, the church emerged from papal darkness, the leading Reformers acknowledged that immersion was the proper meaning of the word baptism—the undoubted practice of the primitive church. On this point, the testimony of LUTHER, for instance, is quite decisive. On no subject, am I able to cite proofs more clear.—See pp. 23, 24, 25, 100, 110. In the preceding pages I have said nothing of MELANCTHON, who seems to have *felt* more deeply on this subject than the rest, and perceiving the Reformers' lack of consistency, confessed that here was the "WEAK POINT" of Protestantism. The Elector of Saxony, for the sake of peace, dissuaded them from the full discussion of the subject.\* It is a *fact* of great importance, that in this respect, the Reformers themselves confessed that the Reformation was imperfect. I say, if this be proved to be a fact, it is a momentous one, and ought to have great weight in this free country, in determining the controversy. Is it not PROVED?

A fourth great FACT is, that in the German Bible, the word baptize, was *translated* by a word denoting immersion. That word is *taufen*. See Luther's testimony upon it, p. 25.

A fifth great FACT is, that the leading scholars whom the Reformation produced, followed Luther with their testimonies to the true import of the word. See the *concessions* of Beza, Casaubon and Witsius, in their criticisms on the Sybilline verse, pp. 15, 16. Also that of Turretin, on the same passage, pp. 13—15, 21, 22. To these many more might be added.

A sixth great FACT is, that the leading writers of the Greeks and Latins, men who had nothing to do with the Protestant Reformation, unite in their testimonies to the same point.

A seventh great FACT is, that the Romish writers use the same kind of reasoning, to defend their doctrine and the sacrifices of the mass, as the advocates

---

\* For proof of this latter fact, my limits will allow me only to refer the reader to my Historical Discourse, Providence, 1839, pp. 65, 173.



of sprinkling use to defend that ceremony. See pp. 66—70. To this may be added the fact, that the Catholics have always warded off the arguments of the Protestants against the changes made by the Papal church in the administration of the Lord's Supper, by the retort, that the church has as much authority to change one ordinance as the other. See Bossuet's 'Tract on Communion in both kinds.

All these are real *facts*, or they are not. If they are, they will be decisive with a consistent Protestant. And my most earnest assertion is, that no man can invalidate the testimony to their reality, without subverting the foundation of all historical evidence, and thus opening the way for a palsyng skepticism touching the grounds of belief, and the certainty of all knowledge.

Admitting the Bible to be the true standard of faith and practice, the great PRINCIPLES on which this discussion turns are these,—

1. In the baptismal law—that is, in the Great Commission, the enacting term, is not used in any *figurative* sense, but has its proper meaning—the same as have the enacting terms EAT and DRINK in the command to observe the Eucharist, the only other Christian rite enjoined on us.

The second great PRINCIPLE is, that where we have an explicit and universal law, enjoining a positive institution, the church has no right to take unto herself the authority, to affix to the terms of that law any new or modern meaning, nor to alter the rite itself, for reasons derived from expediency, instructiveness, convenience, or any other ground.

If these principles are acknowledged to be true, then the cause which I advocate is established. If they are not true, then I know not where to find firm footing in order to stem the floods of skeptical and papal errors which are ever raging around us, and which will surely prevail against us, if we leave any "weak point" exposed to their power.



## CONCLUSION.

In closing my Examination of the Rejoinder, I would now commend the suggestions which it contains, to the calm and prayerful consideration of the reader. Let him remember, that, although the observance of an outward rite has not in itself any saving efficacy, it does not thence follow that it is of little importance. A few words from Dr. Barnes, in his commentary on Mark 16 : 16, is quite to the point in this place. He says, "It is worthy of remark, that Jesus has made baptism of so much importance. He did *not* say, indeed, that a man *could not* be saved without baptism, but he has strongly implied that if this is neglected, *knowing it to be a command of the Saviour*, it endangers the salvation of the soul. Faith and baptism are the beginnings of a Christian life; the one, the beginning of piety *in the soul*, the other, of its manifestation before men, or of a profession of religion. And no man can tell how much he endangers his eternal interest, by being ashamed of Christ before men." To this it may be added, that no one can tell the ultimate results upon the church herself, of any departure from the institutions of Jesus Christ. The grand anti-christian apostasy was brought about by slight deviations from apostolic practice; and the principle, that the church has a right to alter or dispense with a divine command, is a basis strong and broad enough to bear up the main pillars of the system of popery.

The little advance which Protestants have made in Europe since the days of Luther, the increasing influence of the Romish Church in England and on the Continent, and the tendency to Papal doctrines throughout the realm of Protestantism, are sufficient to suggest the inquiry, whether there be not something wrong in the *constitution* of many churches, which have, as to cardinal doctrines, a correct confession of faith. The decline of piety, years ago, among the churches planted by the Puritans in Massachusetts, is a moral phenomenon worthy of study. What an instructive fact is that which

occurs in the history of President Edwards—the dissolution of his pastoral relation to his church in New England. How remarkable, that even he, whose mental powers so far transcended those of other men, and whose piety was commensurate with his intellect, could not urge the Christian rule, that none should partake at the Lord's table except those who gave evidence of a change of heart, without loosening the bonds which united him to his people! Time was, when even in Boston, the spiritual *doctrines* of the Puritans were scarcely heard at all, except from a Baptist pulpit, then occupied by the venerable Dr. Stillman, on whose lips, for more than a quarter of a century, crowds habitually hung with delight and profit. This fact was once candidly recognized by Rev. Dr. Lyman Beecher, when addressing the church to which Stillman once ministered. Said he, "your lamp was burning when ours had gone out." Great as was the personal piety of the Puritans, and of many of their successors, the *constitution* of their churches was not adapted to preserve the purity of their doctrines.

And let it be asked, what can be better fitted to secularize the church, and ultimately to embarrass her progress, than the operation of the principle that an infant comes into the church as well as into the state by virtue of its natural birth; and, as in the latter case, it is entitled to the privileges of citizenship, so, in the former, it is entitled to the sealing rite of baptism. Such a principle must be corrupting, and where its deleterious results are not seen in the general condition of the church, it may be for want of time fully to develop them, or because its legitimate tendencies are mercifully arrested by the providence of God, or the gracious influences of his Holy Spirit. Deeply was I once affected by this thought, when a missionary of the Presbyterian church, who has for years been laboring in Europe, frankly confessed to me, that he wished the nation to whom he had been sent, knew nothing of infant baptism, because then, he might have a closer access

to their consciences, and by rousing in their bosoms a sense of sin, might lead them to embrace the gospel.

But while I speak thus of the tendency of a constitution and the effects of a system, I rejoice to know that there are so many in the various denominations of Christendom whom I can hail as fellow-disciples, and with whom I can cherish spiritual communion. Yes, even among the Catholics, who have changed both the ordinances of Christ, and among the Quakers, who have extirpated both, I have met with those who hold the Head, Jesus Christ, and who seem to be acting "according to their light." The first of these sects inculcate a gorgeous and unauthorized system of rites, and the other have no rites at all; yet among them both, I have known those whom I hold as Christians, and hope to meet in heaven. Their peculiar systems, I must oppose—the arguments for them I would fain refute, and the effects of them I deplore; but as to themselves personally, if they honor the cross of Christ, cherish his spirit, and love him as a Saviour, I would esteem them as brethren, honor them for their virtues, and rejoice that, in any respect, they are "fellow-helpers to the truth."

Still, while I hold my heart and mind open to a just appreciation of all that is good in those who differ from me, and say with Paul, "as far as we have attained, let us walk by the same rule, and mind the same thing," my desire is, that the day may soon come, when the principle, that the Bible is the only rule of a Christian's faith, shall be exalted to a practical supremacy throughout Christendom,—when in regard to baptism, the simple object of each inquirer will be to know *what the Saviour meant by the command contained in his Great Commission*, and when, in the spirit of universal obedience, the united church, bowing at the feet of Jesus, shall say,

Our gracious God, how plain  
Are thy directions given!

"thy word giveth light, it giveth understanding to the simple."













